

**CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT REVITALIZATION
EFFORTS IN OKLAHOMA**

By

ROBERT RUSHING

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

May, 1994

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
December, 1996

**CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT REVITALIZATION
EFFORTS IN OKLAHOMA**

Thesis Approved:

Mike D. Woods

Thesis Adviser

Phil Renkel

Noti Lampford

Thomas C. Collins

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to thank my advisor Dr. Mike Woods for his guidance and understanding during my venture as a graduate student. He was very understanding when tragedy hit my family, and when I needed a push he kept me "pressing onward" to complete my goals. Next I want to thank Norma Eddington for her countless hours working to make this thesis as presentable as it could be, and for her friendship during the past two years. I want to thank my committee members, Dr. Kenkel and Dr. Lansford, for their valuable insight and suggestions concerning my research. I would like to thank Andrea Freeman who helped with the survey data. Her aid was invaluable in keeping the project on time.

Next I would like to thank my close circle of friends whose support and encouragement would help me to complete this monumental task. Thanks to Kelly, Jodie and Collin Cox, Paul and Robin Allen, Skinny and Shannon Bowen, Scott Hamilton, Scott and June Walker, Jerry Martin, and Mike Lawson.

Finally I would like to acknowledge the love and support from my family. My brothers, Chris and Travis, and my sister Kathy, all were very supportive and positive while I was in school. Thanks to my niece, Krista, who is a bright spot in what has been a trying spring. I would like to thank my Dad for his love and strength. He has been relentless in his support and for that I will always be grateful. Lastly I thank my Mom. She is my pillar of strength. She has always supported what I do and I will always cherish her love and support. Thank all of you and God bless.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
The Problem	1
Oklahoma Main Street Program	5
Objectives	6
The Study	6
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	9
Theory	9
Decline of the Traditional CBD, The Downtown Business Area	24
History of Revitalization and Preservation Movements	28
Revitalization Efforts Reviewed	31
Role of Retail in CBD Revitalization Efforts	38
Summary	40
III. METHODOLOGY, PROCEDURES AND DATA REVIEW	42
Methodology	42
Procedures	42
Hypothesis	45
IV. DATA REVIEW	48
Screening Survey Results	48
Detailed Program Survey Results	63
Data Analysis	115
V. SUMMARY	123
REFERENCES	129
ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY	131
APPENDIX I-Sample Cover Letters and Surveys	153
APPENDIX II-Case Studies	168
APPENDIX III-Individual Community Responses	211
APPENDIX IV-Variable Description	226

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Does community have a CBD revitalization program?	48
2. Oklahoma community population 1980, 1990, and survey respondents.	49
3. Was community's CBD the primary shopping and office center for these years? . . .	50
4. Size of CBD in 1986.	51
5. Size of CBD in 1990.	53
6. Size of CBD in 1995	55
7. Status of community's CBD from 1986 to 1990	57
8. Status of community's CBD from 1991 to 1995	59
9. Community comparison table: communities with and without a revitalization program.	62
10. Year CBD revitalization program started.	64
11. Length of time CBD revitalization program has been in operation.	65
12. Which of the following groups were involved in initializing the revitalization program?	67
13. Did you consult with a government agency to assist with the development of the CBD program?	67
14. Does the CBD revitalization program have a target completion date or is the program intended to be continuously ongoing so long as there is support or funding?	69
15. Which category describes the group that managed the CBD during the initial year and in 1995?	70
16. Does the program have a board of directors?	71

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

Table	Page
17. If the program is managed by a private organization, is it a:	72
18. Rate the economic conditions for your community in the initial year and in 1995.	73
19. Rate the future outlook for your central business district over the next 5 years. . . .	74
20. Indicate whether the CBD was the primary retail or office center of your community in the following year.	75
21. If the CBD was not the primary retail center of your city in 1995, indicate why.	76
22. Is there a major discount store (e.g. Wal-Mart) or Outlet Mall located in or near your community?	77
23. Rate the following features of you CBD at the initial year of your revitalization program and in 1995.	87
24. To the nearest \$1,000, what was the size of the CBD revitalization program's operating budget in its initial year and in 1995?	94
25. Program funding sources (as percent of budget) for the initial year.	95
26. Program emphasis areas and success.	97
27. Activities that assist the CBD revitalization program in addressing areas of emphasis.	98
28. If you performed a needs or conditions assessment, which of the following areas were covered?	100
29. Indicate obstacles that have caused problems in implementing the CBD revitalization program for both the initial year and in 1995.	102
30. Business/program incentives available to firms that locate in your CBD.	103

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

Table	Page
31. Was a major private or public development project (e.g. hotel, convention center, office complex, etc) central to the CBD revitalization program?	103
32. Does a review board or historic commission (other than a planning, or zoning board) review alterations and new construction to ensure that they are compatible with the image of the CBD?	104
33. Does a historic ordinance exist in the CBD?	105
34. Aside from historic district ordinances, are there any local ordinances that control design changes?	105
35. Does the CBD revitalization program provide non-financial design assistance to merchants, property owners, etc?	107
36. Was a public relations (P.R.) campaign developed as a major part of the CBD revitalization program?	108
37. Are coordinated retail sales events part of the current CBD revitalization program?	109
38. Are festivals part of the CBD revitalization program?	110
39. Indicate how the following categories have changed since the initial year of your CBD revitalization program in 1995.	112
40. Characteristics of the CBD revitalization program's staff and board members that are most important to the program's success in dealing with outside entities, such as city agencies, merchants, and community groups.	112
41. Characteristics of the CBD revitalization program's staff and board members that are most important to the program's internal management.	113
42. What skills would improve the management of this program?	113
43. Areas which CBD revitalization program could be changed to improve success. . .	113
44. What is the single most important benefit of the CBD revitalization program, thus far?	114

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

The Problem

Many local economies in Oklahoma and the U.S. have experienced periods of decline throughout the latter half of this century. Communities have been affected by changes in the national economy which have lead to many small businesses being unable to compete at the local level. Many of the problems facing local businesses are due to changing economic and social factors. One key economic problem is the leakage of retail sales. This leakage is due to changes in the retail industry.

Consumers have also evolved from 9:00 to 5:00 main street shoppers to evening shoppers who demand greater selection and lower prices. The management structure of the traditional downtown business also can work against efforts to remain competitive. Downtown business merchants who hold traditional business hours and continually carry the same selection of products, lend themselves to losing shoppers who seek out more convenient stores which offer a greater selection. The rigidity of management practices by some downtown merchants limits their ability to compete against new convenient retail centers.

Retail leakage to new shopping centers represents the largest threat to the health of a downtown (Lawhead). New retail centers and shopping malls generally offer lower prices than traditional downtown retailers (Lawhead). Large multi-store retail corporations produce a greater retail sales volume than downtown retailers (Johnson). This increase in volume allows these centers to sell more goods at a lower profit margin resulting in a lower price. These centers usually locate outside of the

downtown area. Urbanization has allowed large retail centers to be erected in areas within easy access of smaller communities (Johnson). Close proximity to many communities along with the increased selection of these retail centers compared to downtown retailers, have lead to large levels of consumers shopping at these retail centers. This represents a large loss in downtown retail sales. An example would be the case of the Cornerstone Retail Community in Michigan. Preliminary census data estimated that \$90,000,000 was spent annually outside of the area's economy (Lackey). Further research discovered that the number was actually closer to \$300,000,000 annually (Lackey). This retail leakage was due in part to changes in consumer shopping habits.

Downtown retailers have suffered from changes in consumer's shopping habits. With improvements in transportation infrastructure and technologies, consumers are more willing to travel greater distances to shop. This increase in mobility has led to consumers being less hesitant to shop outside of their community (Johnson). Large retail chains and centers advertise more than local merchants. Media exposure from the larger centers informs the consumer of the great selection available to them at these centers (Johnson). Local merchants seldomly advertise in the mass electronic media. Consumers are also better informed and knowledgeable with an increased awareness of product concepts (Johnson). These consumers are less likely to limit themselves to only those products which are available to them in their local market (Johnson). Real incomes increased in this period, partially because both husband and wife worked. A two wage earner household demanded non-traditional

shopping hours typical of main street merchants.

A traditional business district is an economic entity which houses several businesses which are in competition with each other (Lawhead). They compete for business in the office, housing, and entertainment markets (Lawhead). Each business must stand alone. Downtown businesses compete against each other as well as the larger retail centers. Downtown shops also tend to hold traditional business hours (9:00 a.m to 5:00 p.m.) which have proven to be more inconvenient for modern consumers (Dworkin).

With all of the problems facing downtowns across the nation one might ask why are they important to a community and are they worth saving? Downtowns are important to communities for many reasons. For most communities the downtown represents the largest employment center (Leinenkugel). Many jobs in a community rest on the vitality of the downtown (Leinenkugel). There is linkage in the economic health of most communities with the economic health of their downtowns (Leinenkugel). Downtowns also represent a large investment in time and capital. With all of the buildings, streets, water lines, and other infrastructure in place, it is not economically feasible to allow the downtown area to become vacant and non-incorporated (Johnson). Most of the investment in downtown resources has already been paid for by previous merchants when the community was growing. This can permit the existing resources to be rehabilitated at a potentially lower cost than starting up a new business in a mall (Johnson). A reduction in start-up costs can allow the downtown area to act as a business incubator for start-up businesses

(Johnson). Competition may not be as stiff in the downtown area which can also aid a start up business. Reinvestment in a downtown will attract further investment (Johnson). A deteriorating downtown will struggle to attract new businesses. Business people want to invest in areas which are thriving, not struggling. Reinvestment will portray the downtown as a viable location for new businesses and thus, increase investment (Johnson).

Downtowns are also one of the largest sources of tax revenue for communities (Leinenkugel). A significant portion of a community's tax base is represented by the central business district. If the district declines in economic activity, its property will decline in value, and this will produce a tax burden which will shift to other parts of the community (Leinenkugel). With a decline in tax revenue there is also a decline in the ability of the local government to provide services to the community.

A community's image and attitude is reflected by its downtown (Leinenkugel). If a downtown is neglected, outsiders will see the neglect as a reflection of the entire community and its citizens (Leinenkugel). Downtowns should be an area which generates pride for local citizens (Johnson). Civic pride and community heritage are represented by downtown buildings and their condition. A downtown is the historic core of a community which tells the tale of that community and of its people (Leinenkugel). These reasons give rise to the importance of studies and revitalization efforts which are aimed at reversing the decline of downtowns.

Oklahoma Main Street Program

Oklahoma's Main Street Program began ten years ago in a time when Oklahoma was in economic depression. Communities across the State were witnessing many of their locally owned stores closing and the continual deterioration of the buildings along their main street. The Oklahoma Main Street Program was initiated to address the problem of deteriorating main streets. The Main Street Program focuses on changing the way people view main street across Oklahoma. Main Street's four point approach (design, promotion, economic restructuring, and organization) is designed to help a community revitalize its downtown.

The Oklahoma Main Street has helped 35 communities to improve their downtowns. The program boasts more than \$100 million in reinvestment into Oklahoma's main streets. Along with the benefit of improving the visual appearance of a downtown, the Main Street Program also has helped to improve the economic condition of many of its program communities. According to the Oklahoma Main Street program, mainstreet communities have created 3,000 new jobs and have a net gain of 1,074 businesses over the last ten years of operation. It appears that the Oklahoma Main Street Program is responsible for many positive changes across Oklahoma. It is important to understand what works and what does not in terms of main street revitalization efforts. Following a ten year history of the Main Street Program in Oklahoma, it is appropriate to pause and evaluate efforts and results.

Objectives

This study which focuses on the revitalization efforts in Oklahoma will take a detailed look into programs operating across the state. The primary objective of the study is to evaluate the effectiveness of Oklahoma downtown revitalization programs including, but not limited to, the Oklahoma Main Street Program. Specific objectives are to identify all towns in Oklahoma with a downtown revitalization effort; determine the types of downtown revitalization programs and the characteristics which distinguish these programs; determine the effectiveness of revitalization programs by their ability to improve the community's situation; and to determine what factors were responsible for the success of a program.

The Study

The study will identify Oklahoma towns with downtown revitalization programs which are currently in operation or have been in operation during the last decade. The study will inventory types of downtown revitalization programs, levels of success in program efforts, and factors which contributed to their success. Major areas addressed will include program organization, financial tools used by the program, role of public relations and promotions, role of design efforts, business development assistance, and the role of government regulations on revitalization efforts. Respondents are given the opportunity to express their ideas of what is necessary for a successful revitalization program in the second survey with a series of open ended questions. This section should provide some valuable insight from

program operators. It is hoped that the determinants of success are items which can be incorporated in communities allowing more communities the ability to improve their downtowns.

The study is broken down into three phases. The first phase involves use of a screener survey. Collecting data from all responding communities and determining if they have a downtown revitalization effort is the primary objective of phase one. Screener surveys were mailed to multiple contacts in 590 communities across Oklahoma. Contacts included mayors, city clerks, city managers, chambers of commerce, and known main street managers. The screener survey was mailed in November, 1995.

Phase two involves the collection of revitalization program data. Data were collected by mailing a second survey to all who indicated in the screener survey that they presently, or in the last ten years have had a downtown revitalization program. The second survey collected data about the history of individual revitalization programs, people involved with the start-up of the program, program financing, program management organization, program objectives, program activities, and program success. Some of the data in the second survey did not apply to all who indicated that they had a revitalization effort. Data were analyzed and presented in response tables. Data were used to rate the success of programs by community. Survey data were used to construct a model which will be used to determine which factors are most important in the determination of success.

The third phase is the visit of eight selected communities for case study

analysis. Case studies will be used to further understand what has occurred in selected communities which has lead to their success in their revitalization efforts.

CHAPTER II REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Theory

Supply Oriented Theory

One of the major contributions to regional and developmental economics is the development of the neoclassical regional growth model (Richardson, 1978). In its simplest version, the neoclassical model explains both regional and interregional factor movements, including capital and labor, in one framework (Richardson, 1978). High income regions import labor and export capital, while poor regions export labor, and with a low capital-labor ratio, may offer higher returns to capital than higher income regions thus are targets for capital importation. The neoclassical model is represented with a continuous function linking output to inputs of two factors, capital and labor (Richardson, 1969). The basic production function is given as:

$$Y=f(K,L,T)$$

where Y is the level of real regional income or output; K is the capital stock; L is the supply of labor; and T represents technological progress, which is assumed constant (Richardson, 1969).

The rate of growth for a region is determined by these three elements/factors; capital supply, labor supply, and technology. These factors are assumed to respond to market signals and move to equalize factor prices in a way representative to a perfectly competitive system. A perfectly competitive system makes these assumptions; transportation costs are zero; there are no economies of scale or agglomeration; resources are mobile, homogeneous and divisible; and information is

free and readily available (Shaffer). Neoclassical growth theory requires that there is continuous full employment of the capital stock when savings and investment are equated. The interest rate is the market mechanism used to equate full employment and investment levels. With an absence of risk and uncertainty, the equilibrium interest rate will be equal to the profit rate, which in turn equals the marginal product of capital (Richardson, 1969). In the neoclassical model for equilibrium growth to occur among communities/regions within a system (country, region, etc.), capital accumulation and output must grow at the same constant rate (Richardson, 1969).

Flexibility in the capital output ratio is key for less restrictive equilibrium conditions (Shaffer). Increasing the flexibility can allow for equilibrium growth among regions whose labor supply varies. Holding capital's income share constant in both regions, the region with the most rapidly growing labor supply will have the lower rate of technical progress (Richardson, 1969). Various situations can be created where an individual community's growth elements differ while maintaining a given growth rate equal to the growth rate of all other communities. Forcing the growth rates to be equal indicates there is an adjustment in elements of the growth equation (production function) (Shaffer).

The key to sustained equilibrium growth is the equality of the marginal product of output among various regions. Variations among regional population (labor supply) can be handled by altering regional values for technological progress. When technological progress in a community exceeds that of another, dynamic equilibrium can be maintained if capital's share in the community with the slower

technological progress exceeds capital's share in the community with the faster technological progress (Shaffer). This occurs because the marginal product of the first community must equal the marginal product of the second community.

The neoclassical model suggests that growth in output or income will arise from increases in the variables of a community's/region's production function:

$$Y=f(K,L,T)$$

with an increase in capital accumulation, K (the supply of capital); with an increase in the population, L (labor force); with some type of technological change, T (technological progress); finally some type of resource shifting from lower- to higher productivity uses will also increase output/income, Y (output or income).

A derivative of the neoclassical model is the productivity model which assumes that all non-natural resources adjust freely to market signals moving from areas of surplus to deficit. Productivity argues that a deficiency of capital be it private, public, or human, is the cause of a lack of community economic development (Shaffer). This theory contends that changes in the goods and services a community exports results from, but does not cause, economic growth. In order for development to occur, a community must generate and finance investments necessary to increase the productive capacity. This arises from the presupposition that the relative mobility of capital funds among communities respond to market signals seeking to maximize resource placement.

The resource endowment theory is another supply oriented development theory. It argues that a community's economic development is directed by a

community's natural resources and the demand for the products produced by those resources (Shaffer). Resource endowment assumes that over time a community can respond to demand shifts by changing resources to the production of different goods and services. The theory contends that community development occurs through the use of its resource base, and that the growth of supportive businesses and activities sustains that development (Shaffer). A major limitation of the resource endowment theory is the long run shift of economic activity away from use of natural resources toward value added goods and services (Shaffer).

Communities can grow by importing capital and labor or by improving the efficiency of using existing capital and labor supplies. Changes in the efficiency of capital and labor use is due to changes in technology. In the neoclassical model technological change is assumed to occur across space and time instantaneously, however this transfer of technology does not occur instantaneously in the real world. In reality new technologies, technological improvements or innovations, usually occur in highly developed regions/cities and work their way down the hierarchy of cities (see central place theory).

Technological improvements usually occur in larger cities because of their greater concentration of capital resources and entrepreneurs. Once an innovation has been created or an improvement to technology discovered, the transfer of this technology usually follows a hierarchial diffusion, moving from one large city to another and finally to hinterland cities. The rate of this transference depends on the degree of change which the technology represents. Highly radical technological

changes typically are adopted slower than more subtle changes. Adoption attitudes favor slow subtle changes in technology, people are creatures of habit and familiarity, they usually favor an old familiar technology to a new unfamiliar technology. Innovations usually are adopted faster near the region of invention/discovery. Typically, the rate of adoption declines as the innovation expands away from its initial location.

Market failures result from the inability of the market to clear. Market signals give information to producers and consumers which will alter their actions in a way that directs the market back to equilibrium. Market failure takes two forms: structural failure and performance failure. Structural failure occurs when the economy does not exhibit the welfare-maximizing characteristics assumed in the neoclassical model. Performance failure occurs when the economy fails to yield an equitable distribution of income and output (Shaffer).

Demand Oriented Theory

Demand oriented economic development theory is based on the premise that a community's development results from an exterior or national demand for regionally produced products. Two important demand oriented theories are the Harrod-Domar model of regional growth and the export base theory. The Harrod-Domar model is the demand oriented theory comparable to the supply oriented, neoclassical growth theory. Harrod-Domar is a Keynesian demand-dominated theory of aggregate growth which may be applied to regional analysis. It is particularly useful in the explanation of growth in lagging regions which usually suffer from a lack of effective demand

rather than a shortage of supply (Richardson, 1969). Lagging regions typically suffer from unused production factors, especially labor. This is important because of the neoclassical model which requires continuous full employment, a phenomena usually not witnessed in the real world. Another use of the Harrod-Domar model is its ability to account for cyclical growth, with certain restrictive assumptions. This is important because regions often display a cyclical growth pattern (Richardson, 1969).

Like its supply oriented counterpart (neoclassical growth theory) the Harrod-Domar model also has many assumptions. There are two sets of assumptions for the model, simplifying assumptions and specific assumptions. Simplifying assumptions are used to make the model easier to work with and understand. They are: a one good economy, which the good can be used as an input or consumed; labor is the only other input and is homogeneous; constant returns to scale; and no technological progress (Richardson, 1969). Specific assumptions are: (1) a constant propensity to save; (2) fixed coefficients in production; (3) the labor force grows at a constant rate equal to the population growth rate.

The model provides a choice of assumptions regarding regional growth. One could assume a region grows at an equilibrium rate from the point of view of both inputs, or at a steady state rate of growth which allows for the inputs to be in a state of disequilibrium while the region grows at a constant rate. In the case of equilibrium growth, planned savings must continuously equal planned investment. For steady state growth, the economy must grow at a rate which ensures both full capacity and full employment. In steady state growth, the capital stock must grow at the same rate

as output, therefore growth is equal to planned investment divided by the capital stock (Richardson, 1969). These explanations of regional growth analysis allow more flexibility than the neoclassical counter part.

Export based theory of growth is based on the presumption that a local economy must increase its monetary inflows in order to grow and the only effective way to do this is to increase the level of its exports. The region's export sector sells its products to someone outside of the community, thus bringing capital into the region (Blair). There are two components of an export based community's economy, the export sector and the non-export sector. The export sector is the engine of growth for the region. Income earned by the export sector is spent and re-spent locally, creating additional income through a multiplier (Blair). The non-export sector sells its products within the community and is subordinate to the export sector of the economy, which supplies capital to the non-export sector.

When export based employees spend their money locally they support the non-export sector, whose employees spend their money locally thus supporting additional non-export jobs. The size of the multiplier depends upon the propensity of individuals to spend money in their local economy rather than in an outside region (Blair). There are several assumptions associated with the export based model: (1) income and employment changes in a community are totally dependent upon changes in the level of exports; (2) marginal propensity to consume locally is stable over time and over a relatively wide range of income change; (3) the amount of local income generated by each dollar of local spending does not change and thus the local labor

content does not vary over time for locally consumed goods and services; (4) there are no changes in the relative prices of capital or labor as their use increases or decreases; (5) additional capital and labor required to expand production is available immediately and without any increase in wages or profits; (6) a community's economic structure at any given time will predict its future economic structure; (7) the homogeneous export sector implies that earnings from separate sub-sectors of the export market are roughly equivalent; and (8) none of the local consumption of the goods and services sold for export comes from importing those goods and services (Shaffer).

When using the export based theory for forecasting a community's economic growth there are five general stages which can be used. They are: (1) to determine the geographic area for study, a compromise between the area of specific interest and the area suitable for data collection may be necessary when forecasting a small community; (2) to describe the local economy and determine the sources of export employment, this is the stage where the multiplier is typically derived; (3) to determine the local multiplier which may be expressed as total employment divided by export employment; (4) to forecast exogenous changes in the local export sector; (5) and to determine total employment changes using the multiplier and export employment forecasts (Blair). The export based theory is useful in explaining growth in small economies, however it begins to experience shortfalls when applied to large economies. A review of institutional effects on economic development will explain some of the discrepancies left from development theories.

Institutions

Institutions are the rights and obligations or social, political, and legal rules that govern the use of a community's resources, exchange, and the distribution of rewards (Shaffer). Institutions are concerned with decision making and can be either formal or informal in nature. Another institutional factor affecting community economic development is the capacity to perceive and accommodate change (Shaffer).

Institutions affect community development in many ways. Institutions affect resource availability (property rights, taxation rates, attitudes about resource usage, etc.), labor supply (entrance of females into the main stream labor market), economic market (setting the structure of the market), and income distribution (defining wage rates, resource ownership, etc.). When institutions fail to support economic development, then changing the institutions becomes necessary. Institutional change means changes in how individuals and organizations interact among themselves and with their environment. There are three basic ways to change an institution. The first way to change an institution is to modify customary social, economic, and political practices within the existing framework with emphasis in the areas which support economic development. The second method of change is to borrow institutions from a different cultural or economic context and superimpose them on an existing relationship (Shaffer). Third is the substitution of a completely new institutional structure for existing ones. Institutional change is typically slow and arduous. There is often much resistance to institutional change.

Entrepreneurship

Entrepreneurship is a key institutional ingredient in community economic development. Entrepreneurs are important because they take risks, they are creative, and they are role models for the business world. It has been observed that small firms (less than 20 employees) account for half of the new jobs created and that these firms have more entrepreneurship per employee than larger firms (Blair). Observers have suggested that regions dominated by large firms will not nurture entrepreneurship because the large corporations will attract young, talented individuals who might otherwise attempt to start their own business. Regions should nurture entrepreneurship and small firms by offering loan programs, business incubators, and other forms of incentives, because small firms are often associated with the early stage of a product's life cycle where percentage growth is rapid and because entrepreneurship is typically learned through the family thus fostering additional entrepreneurship in a region (Blair).

Location Theory

Location theory helps to explain the decision process behind why firms locate in given areas. There are several locational factors which affects a firm's decision on selecting a location, they are: inertia, transportation costs, production costs, demand maximization, and profit maximization (Blair). Inertia is one of the strongest locational factors for a firm. In nature inertia is the property of matter which dictates that if a body is at rest it will continue to remain at rest and if it is in motion it will continue in uniform motion along a strait line until acted upon by some external force. In location theory inertia dictates why a firm may find it difficult to relocate

once a site has been established. Once a firm selects a location, the surrounding community may evolve to reinforce the locational decision, creating a symbiotic relationship between the firm and its surrounding community (Blair).

Of locational factors, transportation costs are the most thoroughly analyzed. When analyzing transportation costs there are several areas which affect location decisions. The type of product and/or production input, will affect transportation costs. If the product is localized then it cannot be easily transported to markets, thus firms locate at or near the final product's market. If the inputs are localized, then the firm locates near the supply of inputs, shipping the product to market (Blair). Transportation costs used in the least cost decision are valued as weights and not dollars. This is done because the model assumes no institutional differences for inputs vs. outputs, or short run vs. long hauls, or for product characteristics. Transportation costs are broken down into ton-miles (Shaffer). Once transportation costs are minimized, location theory begins to factor in other costs related to production. If there is a different site where another production factor (labor) can be attained at a low enough cost to offset the advantage of the minimal transport cost site, then location theory requires that the firm select the site with the overall lowest cost of production and transportation (Shaffer). Recently transportation costs are becoming less important in a firm's locational decision because of three reasons: manufacturing has decreased in importance; technology has lowered the cost of transportation compared to other inputs; and products have a higher value per pound of raw materials today than in the past (Blair).

Production costs are assumed to be equal everywhere except for transportation costs, but localized inputs have become increasingly more important in production cost. The cost of energy, wages, taxes, etc., all play a role in production costs. Firms seeking to minimize these costs will select a location which minimizes these costs along with transportation costs. Energy costs affect transportation costs and are usually regulated by regional economies. Firms whose labor costs tend to be significant to their final product are said to be labor oriented (Blair). These firms use a region's prevailing wage as a measure of regional labor costs. Firms of highly regulated industries which typically are subjected to a high degree of taxation may select a site which offers the lowest taxation rate. Many cost associated with production and location drive a firm's decision to select a site which minimizes their costs.

Demand maximization argues that a firm will select a site that controls as large a market area as possible. The firm can exercise some monopolistic control over that portion of the market which it can supply its goods or services at a lower price than can its competitors (Shaffer). If the market area is assumed to be homogeneous and all firms have the same production and transportation costs, market areas would evolve into a series of hexagonal areas for each firm. Firms would provide goods to customers until transportation costs become inhibitive to the producer and the consumer. When consumers are different and firms face different production costs, the least cost approach yields market areas that are less uniform in their distribution. Demand maximization assumes that markets, raw materials, and labor are all

uniformly distributed which leaves the question of location depending on the transportation cost of the product and how it affects market size (Shaffer).

Profit maximization in location theory deals with the decision to select a site from which the number of buyers whose purchases are required for maximum sales can be served at the least possible total cost. This is a site which monopolistic control over buyers makes it more profitable than a lower cost site. Profit maximization incorporates revenue and cost factors into its site selection analysis. Profit maximization is the usual construct used in community efforts to attract or retain economic activity (Shaffer). Community efforts try to reduce costs, improve access to markets, and alert the decision-maker to the subjective dimensions of the community (Shaffer).

Firm's may have behavioral reasons for selecting a location as well as economic reasons. The behavioral approach allows the firm alternative reasons for selecting a site which may not make sense to other firms or to economic theory, but may have specific benefits to that firm and its situation (Shaffer). Firms may choose to locate in an area because of the quality of life offered by the region's amenities, such as: weather conditions, museums, sunshine, road conditions, schools, public services, and other factors which may indirectly affect production costs (Blair). Business climate can also be a locational decision factor. Business climate roughly relates to taxation rates, expenditure programs, and the general attitude of a community towards the firm and its product (Blair).

Central Place Theory

Central place theory and market analysis attempts to explain why goods are community specific. Central place explains why some types, or levels, of goods are available in a certain sized community and why they are not available in smaller communities. Central place theory separates communities into different levels or classifications by population and services provided. This hierarchy of communities begins with first order services which are often provided by residents within the community (Blair). There are more lower, or first order communities, than higher ordered communities but the higher ordered communities offer a greater variety of services to its citizens. Examples of first ordered goods are: groceries, gas station, etc. Higher level services (second order), such as clothing stores, car dealerships, hospitals, etc., are provided by second order cities. Residents who wish to receive these higher ordered services must travel to these cities to acquire these goods or services. There are third order cities and products as well, the higher ordered cities have all of the services of the lower ordered communities (Hamilton). This hierarchy continues until the largest cities are attained. They sit atop the hierarchy because they are the centers of production for goods that have the greatest market area. The smaller communities produce a good or service with a small market area, usually the local citizens. As the product's market area increases, it serves an area greater than its local clientele.

A product's range is determined by its price and point of sale. The purchaser of the good must pay the product's price as well as the transportation cost to and from the site of sale. Therefore a good's demand decreases with increasing distance from

its sales site (Flood). This distance is measured in terms of physical separation, time, and travel costs. Certain groups of people are more willing to travel greater distances to attain a service or good. Younger more educated people generally are more willing to travel greater distances and more frequently to purchase a good (Shaffer). Transportation costs impose a limit on the range of a good, which can be defined as the maximum distance that a person is willing to travel to attain a good at a central place for the lowest possible average cost (Blair).

On the supply side of the model, the producer requires a certain level of revenue to continue to offer the good for sale. The firm must cover its costs and receive a normal rate of profit by reaching a certain minimum number of consumers who spend a portion of their income on the good (Flood). This minimum population of consumers, which the firm requires to offer the good, is known as the threshold population of the good. This relationship is very important to the availability of various goods. For a firm to offer a good at a central place, the population at the central place must exceed the threshold population of the good being sold (Flood). When a population at a central place does not exceed the threshold population, the firm cannot generate sufficient revenue to justify selling the good. This scenario helps to explain why some communities are void of certain goods and services. Economies of size for a firm and its long run average cost curve greatly influence a good's required threshold population. Population or demand must be at a level sufficient for the firm to produce its good at or near the low point of its long run average cost curve. Demand threshold estimates can be useful to firms in selecting a

location by ensuring there is sufficient demand for a good prior to locating in a particular area thus avoiding market saturation or other ill fated results from poor location selection.

Central place theory assumes that markets are homogeneous with evenly distributed natural resources, population, income, equal transportation costs which are proportional only to distance traveled (not direction traveled), and the people across regions have the same tastes and preferences (Flood). The real world non-ubiquitous distribution of these resources, population, etc., account for irregularities from the hexagonal markets expected in central place theory.

Decline of the Traditional CBD, The Downtown Business Area

Historically the CBD has been the area of a community that has housed the community's major economic activity. However, during the last thirty years a change has occurred in most communities where the CBD has been displaced by new office and retail centers located outside of the traditional CBD area, a community downtown. In the majority of communities the traditional CBD is the downtown or main street area. Changes in the retail industry have led to new large retail centers opening in areas outside of the traditional downtown. This was due to large growth in urban areas across the country.

Shortly after the end of World War II, America began to undergo a change in its socio-economic structure. Federal highway subsidies, the 30-year low interest mortgage, and inexpensive automobiles were all behind the mass exodus of the middle

class into the suburbs (Wagner). As the population of suburbs increased, service and manufacturing industries soon followed the consumer's lead. City streets proved to be too congestive for merchandise deliveries as trucks began to replace railways as the choice for delivering goods (Wagner). Railroads are centralized in their ability to deliver goods. They can deliver goods to a central depot usually in the downtown area. As industries moved into the suburbs, the demand for more mobile and versatile delivery systems lead to the growth in the trucking industry. Manufacturing technologies changed and began to favor buildings with long, horizontal spaces instead of older multi-story buildings traditionally found in downtowns (Wagner). These long horizontal buildings were easily constructed outside of central business districts.

Retail decentralization is the process of relocating retail activities from the central city to peripheral regions (Chase). This decentralization takes many forms such as commercial strip developments, discount malls, and specialized functional areas (Chase). A reduction in the cost of development and property assembly in outlying areas, as compared to downtowns, are also responsible for the location of many retail centers outside of a community's traditional commercial area (Chase). Expansion of transportation infrastructure along with improvements in transportation technologies, have reduced the cost of operating a business in urban areas.

The scourge of many downtown retailers has been the retail shopping center. Retail shopping centers house large chain stores providing competitively priced goods and services at a volume unattainable by smaller operations (Lawhead). These centers

have the ability to move more merchandise and benefit from greater economies of scale than do local merchants who are more restricted in their sales volume. Most local merchants do not utilize the benefits of mass media advertisement to promote their store or products. Conversely, most retail chain stores and shopping centers use this media to attract shoppers from within a community as well as from surrounding communities (Johnson). Mass media is also responsible for another source of retail leakage to many communities. Mail order services, television shopping channels, and more recently Internet shopping services, represent the retail industry's latest attempts to service as wide a field of consumers as possible (Lackey).

Downtowns also were inhibited from their own plans/ideas. With anchor stores leaving downtowns for malls on outlying areas, downtowns tried to confront the mall threat by emulating them. Communities began to isolate their downtowns by closing off their streets and trying to depict the downtown area like a mall (Wagner). Frequently, this type of effort failed.

The end of World War II (WWII) brought about changes in America with the sudden growth of suburbs followed by changes in the retail industry. Downtowns were struggling to find ways to deal with these new challenges, but the industry also witnessed a change in the shopping habits of the consumers. A change which would prove as devastating as any displayed by the retail industry. During WWII women moved into the workforce as men fought overseas. After the war women remained in the workforce and more families became nontraditional as both parents worked. With both husband and wife working, fewer people were at home during traditional

business hours to shop. The retail industry realized this as malls and shopping centers began to operate longer business hours as well as staying open on the weekends. Main street merchants who operated with traditional business hours, were forced to alter their time of business to remain competitive.

Consumers also benefited from a real growth in their disposable income permitting them to spend more on travel while they shop (Chase). Improvements in transportation systems also reduced the cost associated with traveling to shopping centers located outside of a particular community. Consumers became more knowledgeable and informed about products (Johnson). They became less willing to accept the limited selection of merchandise in their community and were more willing to travel greater distance to satisfy their need for a greater selection of goods (Johnson).

Downtown merchants were also placed at a disadvantage by the independent way business is run inside the downtown area. Unlike in a shopping mall where shops work together to promote products, themselves, and the mall in an attempt to draw the most possible people, downtown merchants compete amongst themselves as well as the malls. Traditionally, downtown merchants compete amongst each other for a share in the office, housing and entertainment markets as well as the retail markets of a specific community (Lawhead). Most attempts to unite downtown merchants fail because businesses are owned by an assortment of individuals, all of whom have different ideas and strategies for success as well as often dramatically different rates of success (Lawhead). In a large retail mall, consistency and the intent

to standardize and sustain uniform quality throughout a single department is relatively easily achieved using conventional management and promotional techniques (Lawhead). The same task for a coalition of downtown merchants is more complex and requires creativity, flexibility, and numerous, often fragile, partnerships based upon mutual interest (Lawhead).

Large chain stores also hold an advantage over the locally owned stores in their ownership structure. A national chain store does not confront the problem of succession like a smaller merchant. Most small town shops are owned by individuals who will at some point face the issue of retirement. When they retire they have two basic choices: they can sell their business to another party or close down the business permanently (Eckenstahler). When no one is willing to buy out a store, the community then faces the task of recruiting another business to fill empty space left by the retiring business owner (Eckenstahler).

Continual deterioration of the downtown area in many communities lead officials and developers to create revitalization programs. Seeking out ways to restore a CBD and sustain its economic vitality became the focus of many developers. Historic preservation of downtowns, historic structures, and other historically significant areas was partially responsible for the birth of many revitalization efforts in operation today.

History of Revitalization and Preservation Movements

Though much of the deterioration of downtowns have occurred since the end

of WWII, preservation movements have been in existence long before popular revitalization efforts. Preservationist today and their historical counterparts, both react to the destruction of America's heritage with similar vigor. Today, activist block bulldozers, stage protests, and petition municipal officials, while their counterparts reacted in a similar way to the destruction of historical buildings (Walter). Early preservation movements are responsible for the eventual creation of revitalization movements with the display of a spirit to protect what is historically valuable.

Preservation movements in America began in the 1850s with the founding of an organization called the Mount Vernon Ladies Association of the Union (MVLAU) (Walter). The organization was in response to a group of businessmen proposed that George Washington's house be turned into a manufacturing facility (Walter). Ann Pamela Cunningham (founder and protector of MVLAU) took exception to the idea and issued a national call for donations and support to save the house from conversion. Cunningham formed the MVLAU to protect Washington's home (Walter). This effort continued for nearly a century, preservation efforts were focused on saving buildings and monuments associated with famous people and events (Walter).

The historical preservation movement grew during the 1930s with the restoration of Colonial Williamsburg (Walter). This was the first attempt to preserve an entire community and resulted in the establishment of a large scale-popular outdoor setting for a museum. This well-financed and professionally staffed project dealt with

a great deal of restoration activity and set the high architectural standards required of developers in historic rehabilitations today (Walter).

In 1949, the National Trust for Historic Preservation was created. During the 1950s and 60s, preservation movements created new mechanisms which would aid their efforts in the rehabilitation of historic sites (Walter). In 1966 the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) was passed. The NHPA created the federal Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and required federal agencies to take into account historic resources when planning highways, dams, housing and other public works projects (Walter). The Act also expanded the National Register of Historic Places of the Interior Department's National Park Service, an agency which plays a key role in certifying projects for historic rehabilitation tax incentives (Walter).

One of the most noteworthy creations of the National Trust for Historic Preservation is its Main Street Project. Forged from the need to unite local leaders in their revitalization efforts, the National Trust created the Main Street Program to aid in the revitalization of downtowns in many communities. During a three year period, beginning in 1977, the National Trust for Historic Preservation worked with community leaders in three pilot towns in Illinois, Wisconsin, and South Dakota (Johnson). Early success of the project led to eight federal agencies agreeing to sponsor a process designed to develop the sophistication and organization of small town businesses and to strengthen the states' abilities to deliver resources to support Main Street revitalization (Johnson). These efforts led to the creation of the National Main Street Center in late 1980 (Johnson). The center's purpose was to unite private

and public resources to make them more available to those engaged in downtown revitalization (Johnson).

The Main Street Program may be the most familiar revitalization program, but it is not unique in revitalization efforts. In 1967, the American Institute of Architects established a program called Regional/Urban Design Assistance Teams (R/UDAT) (Hoffer). R/UDAT unites communities in need of professional assistance with professionals willing to donate their time to assisting the community with its needs (Hoffer). Professionals who volunteer for the program represent a wide range of disciplines. Communities pay for travel expenses of the volunteers who work with revitalization officials to create a comprehensive design plan to revitalize the community's downtown. Since the creation of the program more than 500 professionals from more than 30 disciplines have donated an estimated \$3.5 million worth of services to areas in 40 states with a combined population of 21 million (Hoffer).

Revitalization Efforts Reviewed

Initially the Main Street Program was designed to study the reasons downtowns were dying (Lawhead). The program also looked into identifying the many factors that have an impact on downtown health and to develop a comprehensive revitalization strategy that would encourage economic development within the context of historical preservation (Lawhead). The approach to the revitalization of a central business district along with the businesses within the area

revolve around Main Street's idea that the total image of an area must be improved for vitalization efforts to be successful (Johnson).

Essential success factors of the Main Street Approach were revealed in demonstration projects. These factors included the following: a strong public-private partnership; a committed organization; a full-time project manager; a commitment to good design; quality promotional programs; a coordinated incremental approach to economic development which produced achievable concrete goals (Lawhead). The Main Street approach is broken down into four interdependent and equally important parts: organization; promotion; design; and economic restructuring (Wagner).

Organization refers to building consensus and cooperation between the groups that are important in downtown revitalization (Lawhead). There are many groups of people who can be united in efforts to revitalize a downtown (e.g. civic leaders, government officials, merchants, professional groups, citizens, chamber of commerce representatives, real estate agents, and consumers) (Johnson). Promotion involves the marketing of the image of the downtown. Promotional efforts target shoppers, investors, new businesses, tourist, and others who may be interested in the operations of downtown (Lawhead). Promotion is important in the perception of downtown's image. Successful promotions will present the downtown area as an exciting place to do business, have meetings, or engage in other social activities (Johnson). Design involves improving the downtown's image by improving its physical condition without destroying important historical characteristics (Lawhead). Design improvements are not limited to buildings, they cover many areas including street lights, window

displays, parking areas, signs, sidewalks, and all sorts of materials which convey a visual message about what the downtown is and has to offer (Lawhead). Finally, the Main Street program is designed to restructure the economy of the downtown area. Economic restructuring aims to strengthen the existing economic base while seeking ways to diversify it (Lawhead). This is accomplished by helping existing downtown businesses expand, recruit new businesses, convert unused space into productive property and by sharpening the competitiveness of downtown merchants (Lawhead).

Each of the four points are interrelated and alone will not provide as much help to a community. With strong leadership and community support, the Main Street approach has shown signs of success in many communities. Two important factors in the success of Main Street towns are the comprehensiveness of the program and strong local leadership. Education, training and empowerment of leadership is essential to producing programs which successfully develop and reflect local influences (Lawhead). The Main Street approach is structured in such a way that local community leaders are provided with enough information that they can effectively run the program (Lawhead). An ideal local leader would be fully qualified in understanding the process of economic development and has the ability to act as a liaison between numerous individuals and private and public groups but also is willing to take directives from a board of residents, business owners, and elected officials (Lawhead).

Each Main Street community has a special plan formed by the Main Street officials. The Main Street approach is a general guideline for the revitalization of

downtowns and does not attempt to be a single solution for the woes of every community. There are other efforts which try to resolve the deterioration of downtowns. Historic tax credits are one way the government has tried to promote reinvestment in historic buildings. Rehabilitation tax credits were part of the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981. These tax credits were responsible for \$6 billion in rehabilitation expenditures in 6,800 buildings during three fiscal years, 1982-1984 (Walter).

Rehabilitation tax credits are broken down into three tiered investment categories: 25 percent for substantial rehabilitation of "certified historic structures," which may be combined with a 19 year cost recovery period for the adjusted basis of the buildings; 20 percent for non-historic buildings at least 40 years old; and 15 percent for non-historic buildings at least 30 years old (Walter). The 15 and 20 percent credits can be used for commercial and industrial buildings only, and are not available to "certified historic structures" (Walter).

Data collected to evaluate the effectiveness of the historic tax credits show a trend of increased investment in historic structures with the tax credits in place. In 1981, before the 25 percent tax credit was in place, rehabilitation expenditures totaled \$650 million (Walter). In the fiscal year 1982, this total grew to over \$1.5 billion (Walter). By the end of 1984, the rehabilitation expenditures reached \$5.96 billion. Of this total, 61 percent was used for housing projects (Walter).

The National push for historic rehabilitation has lead to many state programs/incentives as well. States are better suited to offer tax credits because they

collect tax revenue from sales, property, and income tax. The federal government is limited to various types of income tax. Most state constitutions are set up to allow local governments some flexibility to establish historic tax credits at the local level.

There are several ways for a community to revitalize their downtown.

Baltimore faces some of the same problems smaller cities face, but on a larger scale. One of the largest employers in Baltimore, the harbor, has seen new life pumped into it as a tourist attraction (Henderson). Baltimore has built a new ballpark for the Orioles in Camden Yards (Hoffer). There are new hotels and office buildings being built in the central business district, these efforts were also accompanied by many social/civic revitalization programs (Henderson). New personnel were brought in to address social issues as well as the economic issues. Task forces were created and worked in tandem with civic organizations to create a plan to improve the social conditions of city life (Henderson). Baltimore saw the need to address social as well as economic issues in its revitalization efforts.

Greenville, South Carolina's revitalization efforts focused on the beautification of the downtown area. Their program sought to beautify existing buildings and public places with the assumption that an improved appearance will bring an improved level of economic activity (Morris). Citizens focused on making Greenville a place for people to come after 5:30 p.m. (Morris). New Orleans has focused on the booming gambling industry. The revitalization effort has been taken to task by public and private sectors. Public projects include expansion of their convention center, restoration of the Canal Street cars, expansion of the Aquarium, and a new sports

arena (Riegel). Private expenditures include construction of the world's largest land based casino, three new river boat casinos, and expansion of the downtown medical corridor (Riegel).

A survey of small towns in Michigan interested in how they recruited new businesses indicated that most communities did not have a person employed full or part-time for the recruitment of new firms (Eckenstahler). The survey revealed that most Michigan towns try to attract businesses with a direct mailing approach (Eckenstahler). Communities would mail prospective firms information about their central business district and about the community. Communities believed that this was the most successful way to attract firms (Eckenstahler). Slightly under half of the communities surveyed, believed that their program for attracting new firms was successful (Eckenstahler). About half of the communities reported they had new businesses open in their community after six months of operating their program (Eckenstahler). Over half of the new firms were started by local people (Eckenstahler). Most communities did not have funds set aside for mailing to potential new businesses located outside of their community (Eckenstahler). Communities which advertised relied on real estate magazines and local news papers to promote their central business district (Eckenstahler).

Local merchants in Viroqua, Wisconsin battled the opening of a Wal-Mart by offering their customers the goods and services which were not available from the retail giant (Ukens). Merchants offered longer hours, home delivery, and mail delivery for rural customers (Ukens). This is an example of how merchants can adapt

without the need for an entire revitalization program.

While there are several reviews of individual revitalization efforts a need for a national review exists. In 1988 there was a national study which reviewed CBD/downtown revitalization efforts during the previous ten years. A 1988 national study of downtown revitalization prepared by The National Trust for Historic Preservation and by The Urban Institute generated a list of factors which were important for the success of a downtown revitalization program. The study examined more than 200 cities and towns across the United States. The study outlines the strategies used, the program and projects developed and the involvement of the private and public sectors (Wagner). After analyzing the data, the national study determined that there were nine factors critical to the success of a downtown revitalization program:

1. Economic base of the community,
2. Type of board running the program,
3. Size of the operating budget,
4. Primary source of funding for the program,
5. Continued presence of obstacles in the program,
6. Objectives and activities of the program,
7. Length of time business incentives have been available,
8. Extensiveness of local use and design controls in the CBD, and
9. Existence of a promotional program.

These factors were determined to be important for responding communities. The national study determined that manufacturing communities (source of economic base) are more successful than other communities. They found that an appointed board was more effective than an elected board. The national study determined that the larger the operating budget the more successful the program. Funding sources that were

local showed community support and were favored over federal or state funding. Obstacles were found to have a negative affect on programs. The objectives and activities of the program were important in keeping the program moving in the right direction. The length of time business incentives had been available influenced the success of businesses in the CBD. Extensive controls of construction and rehabilitation are necessary to keep the appearance of the downtown consistent. Finally a promotional program was necessary to keep strong support for the revitalization program.

Role of Retail in CBD Revitalization Efforts

Economic developers seek to attract manufacturing firms and their distribution facilities or back offices but until recently, few would seek out retail firms as development activities (Lackey). Retail development is important in a community. Communities try to stop retail leakage. They recognize the importance in stopping the out-flow of income from their community's economy. For many developers retail is not thought of as economic development, but as a mere redistribution of current income. Retail does count as economic development when it increases the amount of money available in a community (Pittman). When retail brings money in from outside of the community it becomes an export or basic activity and thus is development (Pittman).

Examples of retail economic development are; regional malls, community centers, outlet centers/malls, national retail specialty stores and restaurants that reduce

leakage, local retail stores that reduce leakage, and tourism-related specialty retail (Pittman). The latter two are often part of a CBD/downtown revitalization program. Local retail stores that produce a specialized good or service can offer community residents a competitively priced product. In offering the good or service locally, the store reduces retail leakage by keeping a community's money in the community (Pittman). Many revitalization programs seek to diversify and promote specialty retail stores. Promotion and support of these stores keeps money from leaving the community for stores outside of the community which offer the same special good.

Tourism-related specialty retail shops capture money spent by tourists. Tourists who are drawn to a community for whatever reason, spend money on a variety of goods and services (Pittman). Development of tourist-related specialty shops can help to maximize the capture of tourist spending. Retail shops that are unique and related to a community or a tourist attraction may positively affect an economy by the increasing amount of tourist income captured by a region. Communities also can reduce leakage by focusing on existing retail operations. First, a common retail strategy or theme needs to be implemented uniting retailers, local officials, and civic groups in the promotion of existing retail stores (Lackey). Second, a visual promotional program (signs) need to be implemented to direct shoppers to clustered retail areas (Lackey). Third, a retail training program to train merchants in the important role of providing a service as well as a product (Lackey). Finally, a buy local program is implemented, encouraging the shoppers to develop a habit of spending/buying local and keeping money in the community (Lackey).

Summary

Cities, and more specifically downtowns, form because of advantages firms enjoy when locating near to each other. This agglomeration reduces costs of operation and increase benefits to each firm. When two similar firms locate near each other they both benefit when one advertises. The firm who places an advertisement draws consumers to their store. The neighboring store also benefits from the presence of the consumer who may decide that the neighboring store has something they wish to purchase. Locating businesses in a concentrated central business district is good for business. Downtowns were founded on this premise.

Downtowns face problems with market failures, more specifically, they face performance failures. These performance failures lead to inequitable distribution of income and output. The downtown merchant's income is threatened by out of area retail and outlet malls. This leakage of income causes less income to be available to a community (tax revenue from the CBD) and its people (downtown business owners). With the decline in income, downtowns are faced with a problem of providing quality services from a declining tax base.

Downtowns have declined for many reasons which seem to relate to each other. Changes in the retail industry along with consumer changes, have caused a decline in economic activity in many downtown areas. This decline has occurred since the late 1940s when people began to migrate from the cities into the suburbs. People became more mobile and willing to travel greater distances to buy goods. Downtowns suffered from an image problem as well. They were perceived as relics

in light of new retail and outlet malls which were springing up across suburbia. The new malls and retail centers offered a greater selection of goods at a lower price because of a greater sales volume compared to downtown merchants.

Efforts to reverse the decline of downtowns revolve around preserving the historical heritage of the downtown while promoting economic growth. Revitalization efforts evolved from preservation movements which began in the late 1800s. People sought ways to promote downtowns economically, while preserving historical heritage. One of the present day revitalization programs is the Main Street Program. Oklahoma presently has a Main Street program in operation with 25 active Main Street communities. The Oklahoma Main Street Program is housed in the Oklahoma Department of Commerce. The Main Street Program emphasizes four key parts to the revitalization of the total image of a downtown. They are design, promotion, organization, and economic restructuring. Other communities in Oklahoma have organized an independent downtown revitalization effort.

Every community differs economically. These differences lead to different ways for communities to address the revitalization issue. Some solutions for a specific case will not work for all cases. This is why there are diverse types of revitalization efforts. Federal, state, and local governments offer incentives for reinvestment in downtown areas. These incentives take shape as tax credits, historical zoning, building ordinances, etc. Communities need to take an inventory of what they have to offer and how can they promote it.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY, PROCEDURES, AD DATA REVIEW

Methodology

Data for this study was collected via a series of surveys. Most data for this study are cross sectional and descriptive. The data include the descriptions of downtown revitalization programs located across Oklahoma. Secondary data are also utilized in determining the effectiveness of revitalization programs. Initial surveys were sent by mail to five groups: city managers, city clerks, mayors, chambers of commerce, and current main street program managers.

Procedures for this study begin with a screener survey. The screener survey was used to collect data from all towns in Oklahoma, but its primary function is to determine which towns have a revitalization program. After the data from the screener survey were collected and summarized, a second more detailed survey was mailed to the cities identified to have a revitalization program. After all of the data was gathered from the series of surveys, the data were summarized and descriptive tables constructed. Data gathered from the second survey are also used in a regression analysis to test the hypothesis of factors effecting success. All of the tables and the regression analysis are used to analyze the success of various revitalization programs.

Procedures

The procedures are broken down into five phases: (a) procedural preparation, (b) screener data collection, (c) primary data collection, (d) case study preparation,

(e) and success analysis.

The first phase of the procedures was to create the survey instruments. There are two instruments: the screener and the primary was survey. Screener surveys collect all of the necessary data to determine which towns have a revitalization program. The primary survey collects data required to conduct a factor analysis of the programs to determine their levels of success. Data from these surveys are cross sectional (descriptive, economic, social, etc.).

The second phase was to collect the data from the screener survey. Screener survey data described the condition of each community's CBD over the last ten years. Screener surveys were sent to all towns and communities in Oklahoma.

Detailed data collection occurred in the third phase. After the towns with a revitalization program were determined, the primary survey was mailed, and data relating to the program collected. This survey captures information on organization, implementation, and characteristics of each of the programs as well as some community characteristics.

Case studies were developed during the fourth phase. The purpose of the case studies was to assist with the description of successful programs. It is expected that the case studies will allow some insight to why given programs work. Case studies will review a community and its program in more detail than is capable with a mail survey.

The final phase of the procedures was the analysis of factors which contributed to the success of a program. The purpose of the study is to determine characteristics

of downtown revitalization efforts which lead to success. This was accomplished by first calculating the degree of success for each responding community. Success was determined by measuring on a six point scale the following 29 related categories:

1. Physical Improvement of Buildings
2. Availability of Building Rehabilitation Finance
3. Physical Improvement of Public Buildings or Space
4. New Construction Activity
5. Building & Property Sales
6. Availability of Building Construction Finance
7. Parking or Traffic Improvements
8. Improvements to Sidewalks & Curbs
9. Downtown Cleanliness
10. New Business Recruitment
11. Business Retention
12. Property Developer Recruitment
13. Delivery of Municipal Services
14. Public Safety
15. Municipal Attitude
16. Improvement of the Image of Downtown
17. Improvement of Retail Shop Variety Downtown
18. Retention of Creation of Specialty Retail District Downtown
19. Special Community Events Downtown
20. Retail Events Downtown
21. Public Relations for Downtown Businesses
22. Job Creation
23. Tax Revenue Generation
24. Control Over Economic Growth
25. Civic Leadership
26. Public Attitude
27. Volunteer Involvement
28. Strategic Planning/Work plan
29. Organizational Development

These factors were rated by community representatives which composed a composite score for the community. Initially each factor was given equal weight and rated on the following scale: 1) Very Good; 2) Good; 3) Fair; 4) Poor; 5) Very Poor. The composite score was used as the dependant variable in the factor analysis.

A stepwise procedure was used to determine which factors were statistically significant at the 95% level. These factors were then regressed in a reduced model and their coefficients calculated and discussed.

Community and program characteristics were grouped into eleven areas which incorporate the above list of factors. A list of the areas can be found in the hypothesis section. Each factor will be tested for its level of significance using the t test statistic. In the analysis each of the factors will be reviewed for their role in a program's success.

Hypothesis

It is hypothesized, from economic theory and review of literature, that the success of a revitalization program is affected by the following community and program characteristics:

1. Economic base of the community,
2. Type of board running the program,
3. Size of the operating budget,
4. Primary source of funding for the program,
5. Presence of obstacles to the program,
6. Objectives and activities of the program,
7. Length of time that business incentives had been available,
8. The extensiveness of land use and design controls in the CBD,
9. Existence of a promotional program,
10. Population, and
11. Location of outlet mall or major retail center.

The economic base of the community is expected to effect the revitalization program. For example, a natural resource based community (energy based) is expected to have a negative correlation due to the decline in activity in the energy

field and a manufacturing based community will have a positive correlation if manufacturing has expanded.

The make up of the program's board is expected to affect the program, with elected boards having a negative correlation and appointed boards having a positive correlation. An appointed board is expected to be more focused on the task of improving their community's CBD than an elected board who is usually elected on popularity and not qualifications. This was found to be the case in the 1986 report 'Revitalizing Downtown' published by The National Trust for Historic Preservation and The Urban Institute. Budget size is expected to have a positive correlation, the higher the budget the more successful the program.

Funding sources are expected to effect the program's success, with local funding sources being positively correlated and federal sources being negatively correlated. A positive correlation of local funds demonstrates a commitment by the local community to the success of the program.

Obstacles are expected to have a negative correlation to the success of a program.

The program's objectives and activities are expected to effect the success of a program. This category will be broken down into groups: (1) building and finance-improving buildings, attracting new firms, offering construction and rehabilitation financing, positively correlated; (2) creation or retention of a business and retail district, negative correlation; (3) improvement of public space, positively correlated; (4) economic growth, positively correlated; (5) needs assessment-if a community did

one, positively correlated, if the community did not, negative correlation.

The length of incentive availability is expected to affect a program's success with a positive correlation. The longer the incentives are in place the more successful a community is at attracting firms and aiding in the success of the CBD.

The number of promotional activities is expected to effect a program's success with a positive correlation. However, there is a saturation point where too many promotions will have little or no positive effect on the CBD and its merchants.

The population of a community is expected to influence a program's success, because a minimal population is required to ensure that the community has enough resources to commit to a revitalization program. The location of an outlet mall near a community is expected to have a negative effect on downtown. Outlet malls represent competition to downtowns and they are typically located in urban area.

CHAPTER IV DATA REVIEW

Screeners Survey Results

Phase I of the study was to determine which Oklahoma communities had a downtown revitalization program during the last ten years. To accomplish this task a screener survey was constructed and mailed to 590 Oklahoma communities. The primary goal of the screener survey was to determine if a community had a downtown revitalization program. Mailing the screener survey to all of Oklahoma's communities also provided a valuable opportunity to collect data from many communities regarding their CBD and economy. Of the 590 communities that received the screener survey 160 responded for a response rate of 27 percent. Of the 160 responding communities 46 indicated that they had a revitalization program in operation during the last ten years, 105 communities indicated they did not have a program nor have they had a program, and nine indicated they were not sure if their community had a program.

Table 1. Does community have a CBD revitalization program?

<u>Program</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	46	29
No	105	66
<u>Does not know</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>5</u>
Totals	160	100

Population of the community was collected from the screener survey to show the distribution of respondents relative to the entire state. It was hoped that survey

respondents would make a fair representation of Oklahoma. According to 1980 and 1990 population census data, the majority of Oklahoma's communities (approximately 63 percent) have a population of less than 1000. Forty percent of screener survey respondents were less than a thousand, this represents the largest group of responding communities. The next largest responding group was the 1001-5000 range at 36 percent. This coincides with Oklahoma's distribution whose second largest group of communities are also in the 1001-5000 range (26 percent). The complete distribution is found in Table 2.

Table 2. Oklahoma Community Population 1980, 1990, and Survey Respondents.

Population Range	Population 1980 ⁽¹⁾	Percent	Population 1990 ⁽²⁾	Percent	Population Survey Respondents	Percent
0-1000	371	63	377	64	65	40
1001-5000	155	26	151	26	60	36
5001-10000	32	5	25	4	10	6
10001-15000	7	1	13	2	6	4
15001-25000	11	2	11	2	11	7
25001-50000	10	2	7	1	5	3
50,001+	5	1	7	1	7	4
Totals	591	100	591	100	164	100

(1) 1980 Census Data

(2) 1990 Census Data

Data concerning the condition of the responding community's central business district were collected over a ten year period with the screener survey. Data were collected for a ten year period including the years 1986, 1990, and 1995. Results from the screener show a general trend of decline in the central business districts from 1986 to 1990 and a stabilization from 1990 to 1995. First communities were

asked if their central business district was the primary shopping and office center for their community during 1986, 1990, and 1995. The majority of respondents indicated that their central business district was their community's primary shopping and office center for all three years. For 1986, 74 percent indicated that their CBD was their primary shopping and office center for their community. This percentage declined to 69 percent in 1990, and remained relatively stable throughout 1995 at 70 percent. Communities whose CBD was not their primary shopping and office center, increased in numbers from 1986 to 1990. Eighteen percent of the communities indicated that their CBD was not the primary shopping and office center of their community in 1986. This value grew to 26 percent in 1990, and stabilized at 26 percent in 1995. Table 3 has a complete summary of responses.

Table 3. Was Community's CBD the Primary Shopping and Office Center for these Years?

<u>1986</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	112	74
No	28	18
<u>Does not know</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>8</u>
Totals	152	100
 <u>1990</u>	 <u>Response</u>	 <u>Percent</u>
Yes	105	69
No	40	26
<u>Does not know</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>5</u>
Totals	152	100
 <u>1995</u>	 <u>Response</u>	 <u>Percent</u>
Yes	107	70
No	40	26
<u>Does not know</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>
Totals	152	100

Data were collected to determine the size of a community's CBD. The size of the CBD was determined by several measures: blocks, square miles, number of businesses, annual sales, and jobs. Data were collected at the yearly intervals 1986, 1990, and 1995.

Table 4. Size of CBD in 1986.

<u>Size in blocks</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
0-1	6	5.0
2-5	67	47.0
6-9	26	18.0
10-19	23	16.0
20-49	17	12.0
50-99	1	.7
<u>100+</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1.3</u>
Totals	142	100.0

<u>Size in square miles</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
0-.5	34	35
.6-.9	4	4
1-1.9	47	48
<u>2+</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>13</u>
Totals	98	100

<u>Size in number of businesses</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
0-9	22	20
10-29	36	33
30-59	25	23
60-99	11	10
100-149	4	4
150-199	4	4
200-299	4	4
<u>300+</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>
Totals	109	100

Table 4. Size of CBD in 1986. (continued)

<u>Size in annual CBD sales (\$)</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
0-499,999	3	13
500,000-999,999	2	9
1,000,000-4,999,999	6	26
5,000,000-9,999,999	5	22
10,000,000-29,999,999	4	17
<u>30,000,000+</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>13</u>
Totals	23	100

<u>Size of CBD in jobs</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
4-49	23	33
50-99	19	27
100-199	11	16
200-399	8	11
400-699	0	0
700-999	2	3
1000-1999	2	3
2000-2999	2	3
3000-9999	0	0
<u>10,000+</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>
Totals	70	100

Most of the respondents indicated that their CBD fell in the 2-5 block range during 1986 (47 percent). The largest response group of communities indicated that their community's CBD was between 1 and 2 square miles in size (48 percent). Most communities had between 10 and 29 businesses (33 percent). Communities were reluctant to respond to questions involving sales figure estimates. The largest group who did respond indicated their sales figures fell in the 1-5 million dollar range (26 percent). Corresponding to the small size of most CBDs, the majority of respondents indicated their CBD employed less than 50 people (33 percent). Table 4 represents 1986 community data.

Table 5 reports the results for 1990. The results are similar to those found in 1986. Most responding communities indicated that their CBD was in the 2-5 block range (47 percent). This is the same as in 1986. As in 1986, most of respondents indicated that their community's CBD was between 1 and 2 square miles in size (47 percent). Most of the respondents indicated that their CBD had between 10 and 29 businesses (33 percent), the same as in 1986. There was a change in the range of annual sales between 1986 and 1990. In 1990, 27 percent of respondents indicated that their annual CBD sales fell in the 10-29 million dollar range. Most of the respondents indicated that their CBD employed less than 50 people (36 percent in 1990).

Table 5. Size of CBD in 1990.

<u>Size in blocks</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
0-1	9	6.0
2-5	66	47.0
6-9	25	18.0
10-19	23	16.0
20-49	16	11.0
50-99	1	.7
<u>100+</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1.3</u>
Totals	142	100.0
 <u>Size in square miles</u>	 <u>Response</u>	 <u>Percent</u>
0-.5	34	34
.6-.9	4	4
1-1.9	46	47
<u>2+</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>15</u>
Totals	99	100

Table 5. Size of CBD in 1990. (continued)

<u>Size in number of businesses</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
0-9	24	21
10-29	38	33
30-59	25	22
60-99	12	11
100-149	5	4
150-199	4	4
200-299	5	4
<u>300+</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
Totals	114	100
 <u>Size of CBD in annual sales (\$)</u>	 <u>Response</u>	 <u>Percent</u>
0-499,999	3	12
500,000-999,999	2	7
1,000,000-4,999,999	6	23
5,000,000-9,999,999	3	12
10,000,000-29,999,999	7	27
<u>30,000,000+</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>19</u>
Totals	26	100
 <u>Size in jobs</u>	 <u>Response</u>	 <u>Percent</u>
0-49	27	36
50-99	16	22
100-199	13	18
200-399	8	11
400-699	1	1
700-999	2	3
1000-1999	3	4
2000-2999	1	1
3000-9999	0	0
<u>10000+</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>
Totals	74	100

The physical size of the CBD did not vary much from 1986 to 1995. Table 6 reports the responses from communities for the year 1995. Again most of the respondents indicated that their CBD was 2-5 blocks in size (46 percent). Size in square miles did not vary from 1986 and 47 percent of the responding communities

indicated that their CBD was in the 1-2 square mile range. Most of the respondents indicated that their CBD has between 10-29 businesses (31 percent). Annual sales for the 1995 period was similar to the 1990 period in that most responses fell in the 10-20 million dollar range (26 percent). Finally, the number of jobs in the CBD was consistently under 50 for all three years. For 1995, 39 percent indicated their CBD employs less than 50 people.

Table 6. Size of CBD in 1995.

<u>Size in blocks</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
0-1	7	5
2-5	65	46
6-9	26	18
10-19	25	17
20-49	17	12
50-99	1	1
<u>100+</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
Totals	143	100

<u>Size in square miles</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
0-.5	34	34
.6-.9	4	4
1-1.9	46	47
<u>2+</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>15</u>
Totals	99	100

<u>Size in number of businesses</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
0-9	28	21
10-29	41	31
30-59	23	18
60-99	17	13
100-149	5	4
150-199	6	5
200-299	7	5
<u>300+</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>
Totals	131	100

Table 6. Size of CBD in 1995. (continued)

<u>Size of CBD in annual sales (\$)</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
0-499,999	5	16
500,000-999,999	2	7
1,000,000-4,999,999	6	19
5,000,000-9,999,999	4	13
10,000,000-29,999,999	8	26
30,000,000+	6	19
Totals	31	100

<u>Size in number of jobs</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
0-49	37	39
50-99	17	18
100-199	12	13
200-399	14	15
400-699	2	2
700-999	2	2
1000-1999	6	7
2000-2999	2	2
3000-9999	1	1
10000+	2	1
Totals	95	100

Data in Table 3 indicate that many communities had economic difficulties from 1986 to 1990 which stabilized from 1991 to 1995. Further evidence of this decline is present in Table 7 which is concerned with the status of the community's CBD from 1986 to 1990. Most of the communities that responded to the survey indicated that their CBD was stable or in a state of decline from 1986 to 1990 (41 percent). Of the 41 percent who indicated their CBD was declining, 34 percent indicated that the decline was due to local economic conditions. Other reasons for the declining of community CBDs are fairly evenly distributed between: status of the state/national economy; presence or lack of a revitalization program; competition from outlet and retail centers (17 percent, 18 percent, and 16 percent respectively). Of the 41 percent

Table 7. Status of Community's CBD from 1986 to 1990

	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Declining	65	41
<u>Reason</u>		
Status of local economy	56	34
Status of state/national economy	27	17
Property ownership issues	7	4
Presence or lack of a revitalization program	29	18
Competition from outlet malls or retail centers	26	16
Other	18	11
Totals	163	100
Stable	65	41
<u>Reason</u>		
Status of local economy	56	38
Status of state/national economy	32	21
Property ownership issues	15	10
Presence or lack of a revitalization program	23	15
Competition from outlet malls or retail centers	12	8
Other	12	8
Totals	150	100
Growing/Improving	22	14
<u>Reason</u>		
Status of local economy	19	40
Status of state/national economy	10	21
Property ownership issues	6	12
Presence or lack of a revitalization program	8	17
Competition from outlet malls or retail centers	1	2
Other	4	8
Totals	48	100
Does not know	5	4
<u>Reason</u>		
Status of local economy	2	20
Status of state/national economy	2	20
Property ownership issues	0	0
Presence or lack of a revitalization program	2	20
Competition from outlet malls or retail centers	2	20
Other	2	20
Totals	10	100

who indicated that their community was stable, 38 percent indicated that their stability was due to the status of their local economy. The next largest reason for stability was the status of the state/national economy at 21 percent. Presence or lack of a revitalization program accounted for 15 percent of the stability responses.

From 1986 to 1990, 14 percent of the responding communities indicated that their community was growing/improving. Most of these respondents indicated that their local economy's status was the reason for the growth (40 percent). The next largest reason for growth was the status of the state/national economy at 21 percent, followed by presence or lack of a revitalization program at 17 percent. The communities who were growing or improving indicated they had less competition from outlet malls and retail centers (2 percent), than communities in decline (16 percent). There were five communities who did not know the status of their CBD from 1986 to 1990. This can be explained by new personnel who are unfamiliar with the community before their arrival.

Oklahoma's communities appeared to stabilize and improve during the 1990 to 1995 period. The percent of CBDs in decline dropped from 41 percent in 1990 to 25 percent in 1995. Those communities whose CBD was declining indicated that the decline was due to the status of their local economy (32 percent). The next largest reason for the decline was spread relatively even over these categories: status of state/national economy; presence or lack of a revitalization program; competition from outlet malls or retail centers (15 percent, 16 percent, and 16 percent respectively). Most of the communities indicated that they were growing or improving from 1990 to

Table 8. Status of Community's CBD from 1991 to 1995

	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Declining	38	25
<u>Reason</u>		
Status of local economy	28	32
Status of state/national economy	14	15
Property ownership issues	7	8
Presence or lack of a revitalization program	15	16
Competition from outlet malls or retail centers	15	16
Other	12	13
Totals	91	100
Stable	48	31
<u>Reason</u>		
Status of local economy	38	36
Status of state/national economy	20	19
Property ownership issues	8	8
Presence or lack of a revitalization program	20	19
Competition from outlet malls or retail centers	13	12
Other	7	6
Totals	106	100
Growing/Improving	67	44
<u>Reason</u>		
Status of local economy	54	36
Status of state/national economy	23	16
Property ownership issues	17	12
Presence or lack of a revitalization program	30	20
Competition from outlet malls or retail centers	6	4
Other	18	12
Totals	148	100
Does not know	0	0
<u>Reason</u>		
Status of local economy	0	0
Status of state/national economy	0	0
Property ownership issues	0	0
Presence or lack of a revitalization program	0	0
Competition from outlet malls or retail centers	0	0
Other	0	0
Totals	0	100

1995 (44 percent). Stable communities indicated that their stability was due to the status of their local economy (36 percent) followed by the status of the state/national economy and presence or lack of a revitalization program (both at 19 percent). The stable communities also indicate they face less competition from outlet malls and retail centers (12 percent) than declining communities (16 percent). Competition from retail centers is even lower in growing/improving communities (4 percent).

Growing/Improving communities account for 44 percent of the respondents in 1995. Most of the respondents indicated that they grew because of the status of their local economy (36 percent). Presence or lack of a revitalization program was the next largest reason given (20 percent), for the growth of these communities, followed by the status of the state/national economy (16 percent). Other reasons and property ownership issues were next at 12 percent. For the recent data there were no respondents who indicated that they did not know the status of their CBD from 1991 to 1995.

Oklahoma communities appeared to have a difficult time in the period from 1985 to 1990 and improved in the period of 1991 to 1995. To determine if the establishment of a revitalization program was beneficial to communities, data from the screener survey was divided into two respective groups: communities with a revitalization program and communities without a revitalization program. Table 9 reports screener survey results divided into the two groups. Other factors along with the existence of a revitalization program appeared to have an affect on some communities. Communities with a revitalization effort were larger in size and

population. Communities with a revitalization program averaged 27,654 population with CBD size of 21 blocks and 125 businesses. Compared to communities without revitalization program that averaged 4,691 population with CBD size of eight blocks and 37 businesses. Figures are similar for both community groups reporting that their CBD was the primary shopping and office center for their community.

Status of the local economy was somewhat similar in both community groups for the period of 1985 to 1990. Communities with a revitalization program had the largest portion of their communities with an economy that was stable (38 percent) or declining (38 percent). Communities with a program also had the larger percentage of communities whose economy was growing or improving during this period (24 percent) that communities without a revitalization program (10 percent).

Communities with a revitalization program had a better economic recovery in the 1991 to 1995 period, with 69 percent of the communities reporting their economy as Growing/Improving compared to 32 percent for communities without a revitalization program. Communities with a revitalization program had 21 percent of their communities with a stable economy, compared to 37 percent for communities without a revitalization program. Communities without a revitalization program had 29 percent of the communities with a declining economy compared to 10 percent for communities with a revitalization program.

TABLE 9
Community comparison table:
communities with and without a revitalization program.

Characteristic from screener survey	Community with a program	Community without a program
Population Average*	27,654	4,691
CBD Size in:		
Blocks (Average)*	21	8
Businesses (Average)*	125	37
Was the CBD the primary shopping and office center for the community?		
Yes	69 percent	63 percent
No	29 percent	33 percent
Does not know	2 percent	4 percent
Status of the economy from 1985 to 1990.		
Growing/Improving	24 percent	10 percent
Stable	38 percent	43 percent
Declining	38 percent	40 percent
Does not know	0 percent	7 percent
Status of the economy from 1991 to 1995.		
Growing/Improving	69 percent	32 percent
Stable	21 percent	37 percent
Declining	10 percent	29 percent
Does not know	0 percent	2 percent

* Both Oklahoma City and Tulsa have revitalization programs thus, the population and CBD size may appear skewed. These figures without OKC and Tulsa are:

For communities with a CBD revitalization program.

Population 10,012

CBD size in:

Blocks 14

Businesses 107

Detailed Program Survey Results

Response rates and program initialization

A detailed second survey was mailed to 56 communities. This includes the 46 which responded to the screener survey indicating they had a revitalization program plus 10 communities known to have a program. Of the 56 communities, 37 responded for a response rate of 66 percent. Twenty-five of the respondents were current Main Street communities. Two of the 37 responses were incomplete, one did not have an actual revitalization program and the other did not complete the survey. Table 10 indicates the communities that responded to the second survey and when they started their central business district revitalization program. Tables 11 to 45 report the responses to the second survey. For some tables, less than 37 responses are reported due to non-response to a specific question.

TABLE 10
Year CBD revitalization program started.

<u>Town</u>	<u>Year</u>
Ada	1987
Alva	1986
Ardmore	1989
Atoka	1994
Bethany	1988
Billings	1993
Broken Arrow	1994
Checotah	1993
Chickasha	1987
Cordell	1993
Davis	1990
Duncan	1986
El Reno	1988
Enid	1994
Geary	----
Grayson	1995
Hooker	1994
Hulbert	1992
McAlester	----
Miami	1995
Mountain View	1995
Newkirk	1992
Nowata	1992
Oklahoma City (Stockyards City)	1992
Okmulgee	1986
Pawhuska	1987
Perry	1995
Ponca City	1987
Prague	1994
Purcell	1992
Sand Springs	1990
Sapulpa	1990
Shawnee	1989
Stillwater	1989
Stratford	1995
Stroud	1994
Woodward	1990

Table 11 shows the length of time Central Business District revitalization programs have been in operation. Most revitalization programs have been in operation for one to three years (40 percent). The next largest group is the seven years and older group (25.7 percent) followed by the four to six year group (20 percent) and the fewest CBD programs are less than a year old (14.3 percent).

TABLE 11
Length of time CBD revitalization program has been in operation.

<u>Years*</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
0-1	5	14.3
1-3	14	40.0
4-6	7	20.0
<u>7+</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>25.7</u>
Totals	35	100.0

* Average length of time in operation = 4.2 years

Survey responses indicate that several parties are usually involved in the initiation of a CBD revitalization. Local merchants or property owners in the CBD were involved in 91.4 percent of the CBD program initiation. This makes sense because the group who is most likely to benefit from a CBD program is the business/property owners and merchants who are in the CBD area. Their business vitality is directly tied into the vitality of the CBD, thus it is in their best interest to initiate a CBD revitalization program to possibly improve their business activity level. A CBD program would should benefit local finance institutions. An improvement in CBD business activity should spur new businesses and reinvestment in buildings in the

CBD area. All of which requires capital to accomplish. The second largest group of CBD program initiators are bankers who helped to initiate 71.4 percent of the responding CBD programs. Community organizers and activist along with corporate and civic leaders other than CBD property owners were involved in 65.7 percent of the CBD programs initiated. Community organizers and activist take an interest in the downtown as a symbol of a community. They would be interested in a CBD program to restore and protect the historic appearance of their downtown and to promote the downtown as a social center for the community. Property owners outside of the CBD probably realize that in many smaller communities the CBD is still the major shopping area for the community. In these instances the health of the CBD affects their business as well for they probably need the CBD to attract customers into town. In more than half of the cases mayors or other elected or appointed officials and city managers or other public staff were involved in the initiation of the CBD program in their community (57.1 and 54.3 percent respectively). City leaders have an obligation to make their town as marketable as possible in an attempt to attract new business investors and consumers. A CBD program may give a community an edge in the competition among communities for shopping revenue. In most cases CBD programs were initiated by local people and this would make sense being they have a genuine interest in the health of their community. One group of people who were involved in only 14.3 percent of CBD program initiations were technical assistance providers. A group of "other" program initiators was involved in 14.3 percent of program initiations. Table 12 summarizes this information.

TABLE 12
**Which of the following groups were involved in initiating
the revitalization program?⁽¹⁾**

<u>Group</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Local merchants or property owners in the central business district	32	91.4
Bankers	25	71.4
Corporate and civic leaders other than central business district property owners	23	65.7
Mayor or other elected or appointed officials	20	57.1
City manager or other public staff	19	54.3
Technical assistance providers (consultants)	5	14.3
Community organizers and activists	23	65.7
Other ⁽²⁾	5	14.3

⁽¹⁾ Based on 35 survey responses

⁽²⁾ Other responses:

Local University and Local Church
Task Force
Volunteers
Chamber and Arts Council
Chamber of Commerce and Individual

A majority of those involved with the initialization of the CBD revitalization program consulted with a government agency (62.8 percent) (Table 13). These communities consulted State, local, and Federal government agencies to assist with the development of the CBD program.

TABLE 13
**Did you consult with a government agency to assist with the development of the
CBD program?**

	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	22	62.8
No	12	34.4
No Response	<u>1</u>	<u>2.8</u>
Total	35	100

TABLE 13 (continued)

List of government agencies consulted for assistance with the development of CBD programs. (Number in parenthesis indicate multiple responses.)

Local

City
City of Alva
City of Ardmore
City Planning Department-Technical Assistance
City Development Authority-Concept and Funding
Ponca City Planning Department
City of Purcell
City of Woodward/City Manager, various offices

State

Oklahoma Main Street Program (6)
Oklahoma Department of Commerce (2)
Oklahoma State University
EODD (Eastern Oklahoma Development District)-Grants
Certified Cities Program-Oklahoma State Chamber of Commerce
Department of Transportation-Grant Request

Federal

National Main Street Center (2)

Most of the communities (91.4 percent) responding to the second survey indicated that their CBD program was a continual-funds permitting effort without a targeted completion date (Table 14). Only 8.6 percent of the communities have a targeted completion date for their program. For the three communities with targeted completion dates, the range of time anticipated for program completion is four to five years.

TABLE 14

Does the CBD revitalization program have a target completion date or is the program intended to be continuously ongoing so long as there is support or funding?

	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Specified completion targeted*	3	8.6
Ongoing effort (funds permitting)	<u>32</u>	<u>91.4</u>
Total	35	100.0

***If a specified completion is targeted what is the date?**

1990-Alva

1998-Billings

1999-Mountain View

Program Management

When asked to select from a category which group managed their CBD revitalization program, communities indicated that in most cases the program was managed by private organizations (48.6 percent in the initial year and 58.1 percent in 1995). These responses would most likely represent Main Street communities which represent the largest group of communities responding to the second survey (Table 15). In both the initial year and in 1995, citizen groups were the second largest group of program managers (28.6 percent in the initial year and 18.6 percent in 1995). The category of "other" was selected nine times (25.7 percent) in the initial year and only four times (9.3 percent) in 1995. Many of the "other" selections coincided with other categories. This may be due to initial management organizations not exactly knowing which type of group they were because their program was not exactly specified in its goals. As the programs become more focused the management group could better fine tune their role and categorization. In initial year responses,

public official(s) or agency was selected eight times (22.9 percent) and for 1995 was selected six times (14 percent).

TABLE 15
Which category describes the group that managed the CBD during the initial Year and in 1995.

<u>Initial Year</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Public official(s) or agency	8	22.9
Private organization(s)	17	48.6
Citizen groups	10	28.6
Other ⁽¹⁾	<u>9</u>	<u>25.7</u>
Total	44	100.0

<u>In 1995</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Public official(s) or agency	6	14.0
Private organization(s)	25	58.1
Citizen groups	8	18.6
Other ⁽¹⁾	<u>4</u>	<u>9.3</u>
Total	43	100.0

⁽¹⁾ **If other list the category of the group:**

Public Non-Profit, 501 (c) (3)
 Newly formed non-profit organization
 Non-Profit 501 (c) (3)
 Funding and directors salary provided by community donations. We are 501 (c)

(3)

Volunteer
 Non-Profit Corp.
 Non-Profit organization
 Board of Directors (Group of Community Leaders)
 501 (c) 6 Public and Private Non-Profit

⁽²⁾ **If other list the category of the group:**

Non profit organization
 Board of Directors
 501 (c) 6

A majority of communities (88.6 percent) have some sort of governing board for their CBD program (Table 16). Only four of the 35 responses (11.4 percent) did not have a board of directors. A board of directors with 11-15 members is most common (60 percent) among programs with a governing board. Boards of extreme size (relatively) are less frequent with small boards (1-5 members) representing 10 percent of the programs with boards, and large boards (16+ members) representing 6.7 percent of the programs with boards. Communities with a board of directors were more likely to elect their members than appoint them (45.5 percent of boards were elected and 24.2 percent were appointed). Some communities have a board of directors with members that are elected and appointed (30.3 percent).

TABLE 16
Does the program have a Board of Directors?

	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes*	31	88.6
No	4	11.4
Total	35	100.0

*If yes, how many members serve on the board?	<u>Members</u>	<u>Response</u>
	3	1
	5	2
	8	2
	9	3
	10	2
	11	4
	12	2
	13	5
	14	3
	15	4
	18	2

TABLE 16 (continued)
Does the program have a Board of Directors?

Are they elected or appointed?	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Elected	15	45.5
Appointed	8	24.2
Some elected and some appointed	<u>10</u>	<u>30.3</u>
Total	33	100.0

Programs that were managed by a private organization were mainly non-profit organizations (Table 17). Non-profit organizations managed programs for 26 communities (92.9 percent). There were only two (7.1 percent) which operated for profit. Of the non-profit programs, the majority, 19 communities (67.9 percent) were 501 (c) (3), six communities (21.4 percent) were 501 (c) (6), and one community (3.6 percent) was a 501 (c) (1) organizations.

TABLE 17
If the program is managed by a private organization, is it a:

	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
For profit organization	2	7.1
Non-profit organization ⁽¹⁾ :		
501 (c) (3)	19	67.9
501 (c) (6)	6	21.4
501 (c) (1)	<u>1</u>	<u>3.6</u>
Total	28	100

⁽¹⁾: 501(c)-non-profit organizations with gross receipts of less than \$100,000 and total assets of less than \$250,000 at the years end.

- (1)-corporations organized under act of congress
- (3)-private organizations
- (6)-business leagues

Community Economic Characteristics

Economic conditions of responding communities were rated at the time of the initiation of the CBD program and in 1995 (Table 18). Half of the communities (50 percent) indicated their economy was in a fair state in the initial year of their program. Of the other half of the communities, 26.5 percent felt their economy was in poor shape, 8.8 percent felt it was in very poor shape, 11.8 percent felt it was in good condition, and 2.9 percent felt it was in very good condition. The numbers are somewhat more favorable in 1995. More than half of the communities (54.6 percent) rated the economic condition for their community as good. An equal number of communities, seven (21.2 percent of responses) for each group, rated their conditions as very good and fair. Only one community (3 percent) felt their economy was poor and none rated their economy as very poor.

TABLE 18
Rate the economic conditions for your community in the initial year and in 1995.

<u>Initial Year</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Very good	1	2.9
Good	4	11.8
Fair	17	50.0
Poor	9	26.5
Very Poor	<u>3</u>	<u>8.8</u>
Total	34	100.0
<u>1995</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Very good	7	21.2
Good	18	54.6
Fair	7	21.2
Poor	1	3.0
Very Poor	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	33	100.0

When asked to rate the outlook for the community's CBD over the next five years, 16 (45.7 percent) rated their CBD's outlook was very good, 15 (42.9 percent) rated their outlook as good, three (8.6 percent) rated their outlook as fair, and 1 (2.8 percent) rated their outlook as poor (Table 19). No community expected their CBD's outlook to be very poor.

TABLE 19
Rate the future outlook for your central business district over the next 5 years.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Very good	16	45.7
Good	15	42.9
Fair	3	8.6
Poor	1	2.8
Very Poor	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	35	100.0

A vital downtown depends on many factors. A community must contend with the competition from other communities for business location and shopping power. It is important for a community to promote their CBD and to make it the primary shopping and office center for the community. Before a community can attempt to attract new businesses it should stabilize the businesses already located downtown. More than half (55.9 percent) of the communities responding to the survey indicated their CBD was the primary retail center for their community during the initial year of their revitalization program (Table 20). Nearly two thirds (64.5 percent) of the communities were the primary office center for their communities at the same time. There has been little change in the number of communities whose CBD is the primary retail center of their community (54.2 percent). However, the number of communities whose CBD is the primary office center has increased to 75 percent.

TABLE 20
Indicate whether the CBD was the primary retail or office center of your community in the specified year.

<u>Initial Year</u>				
	<u>Retail Center</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Office Center</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	19	55.9	20	64.5
No	<u>15</u>	<u>44.1</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>35.5</u>
Total	34	100.0	31	100.0

<u>1995</u>				
	<u>Retail Center</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Office Center</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	19	54.2	24	75.0
No	<u>16</u>	<u>45.8</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>25.0</u>
Total	35	100.0	32	100.0

Communities who indicated that their CBD was not the primary retail center for their community (45.8 percent, 1995) was asked to indicate why from a list of possible reasons (Table 21). Competition from other retail centers outside of the community was the most numerous selection (25.5 percent). This indicates that these communities are competing with other communities for the shopper's dollar and they are losing money in the form of retail leakage, a very large problem to many communities. Competition within the community from strip malls, outlet malls, and other retail centers was the second largest selection (23.4 percent). Here the shopper's dollar is staying in the community, but this can still prove to be problematic. A loss of anchor stores or change in retail mix (19.1 percent) was the next largest reason for a community's CBD not being the primary retail center for the community. The rest of the selections mirror typical problems facing downtowns: downtown's unfavorable image (12.8 percent), changes in consumer shopping habits (8.5 percent), inadequate parking (6.4 percent), and other reasons (4.3 percent) like the development of big box stores.

TABLE 21

If the CBD was not the primary retail center of your city in 1995, indicate why.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Competition from other retail centers within the community	11	23.4
Competition from other retail centers outside of the community	12	25.5
Changes in consumer shopping habits	4	8.5
Loss of anchor stores or change in retail mix	9	19.1
Inadequate parking	3	6.4
Unfavorable image of downtown	6	12.8
Other*	<u>2</u>	<u>4.3</u>
Total	47	100.0

* Other reason: Too much development of big box stores. Box stores refer to chain discount stores and national retail stores.

The effect of major retail stores and outlet malls expanding into smaller communities was measured by asking respondents to indicate if there was such a store within the community, within 30 miles of the community, or within 60 miles of the community (Table 22). Communities were also asked to describe the effect of the store on the community's CBD. Twenty three of the communities responding to the survey (67.6 percent) had a major discount store or outlet mall within their community. Nine communities (26.5 percent) had a major discount store or outlet mall located within 30 miles of the community. Two communities (5.9 percent) have a major discount store located 60 miles from the community. Twenty one of the communities (63.7 percent) indicated that the major discount store or outlet mall was detrimental to the community's CBD. However there were some communities (24.2 percent) who felt that a discount store or outlet mall was beneficial to the CBD. Other communities (12.1 percent) believe that the discount store or outlet mall has no affect on the CBD of their community.

TABLE 22
Is there a major discount store (e.g. Wal-Mart) or Outlet Mall located in or near your community?

	Yes	Percent
Within the community	23	67.6
Within 30 miles	9	26.5
Within 60 miles	<u>2</u>	<u>5.9</u>
Total	34	100.0

If yes, what is its effect on your CBD?	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Beneficial	8	24.2
Detrimental	21	63.7
No Effect	<u>4</u>	<u>12.1</u>
Total	33	100.0

If no effect, why?

Different market niches.

There was in 92'-93' and it was detrimental to our CBD. We are having to rebuild business after Wal-Mart left.

The retail offered downtown does not match the major discount store.

Our retail is geared toward the cowboy, farmers, ranchers.

If beneficial, why?

It keeps this downtown unique and able to focus on our community needs.

Some benefits-brings people from larger radius.

Brings county residents to town.

Tax base.

Draws more people to our town. We market to them with different--

We receive grants for economic development from Wal-Mart.

It brings a lot of out of town people to our community.

It brings people to our town and if item is not found there they come downtown.

Our CBD is a very "specialized" area. Both K-Mart and Wal-Mart actively support our Main Street Program.

TABLE 22 (continued)
Is there a major discount store (e.g. Wal-Mart) or Outlet Mall located in or near your community?

If detrimental, why?

Head-on competition with some.
 Marketing practices are used to destroy hometown economic base.
 Has contributed to the decentralization of a centralized business district.
 Draws customers away from CBD. We have compensated with niche retailing (antiques, etc.).
 CBD did not know how to compete.
 Lost product selection due to small business closing. The loss of Wal-Mart now would be devastating.
 Prices are lower than local retailers, driving some local stores out of business.
 Takes traffic away from CBD. It also deters retail dollars. but they change traffic patterns to.
 Local shoppers overlook local merchants-our dollars go out of town.
 Because it's at the mall, which is away from downtown.
 Cheaper at Wal-Mart and I stop shopping.
 Pulls shoppers out of town.
 Citizens shop at discount instead of shopping local retail.
 Caused closing of only grocery store, small businesses cannot compete.
 It's taking our consumers away from stores we do have, i.e. grocery, pharmacy.
 Pulls business from discount store traditionally in CBD.
 Wal-Mart drawing power.
 Hours, price, variety, parking, big ad budget.
 The majority of the Prague customers and regional consumers began shopping at the Shawnee Mall for better prices on products and the shopping at the mall provided services at more convenient hours.

Condition of the Community's CBD/downtown

Communities were asked to rate 13 features of their CBD at the time of their revitalization program's initiation and at 1995 (Table 23). A scale was provided for rating the features: 1=very good, 2=good, 3=fair, 4=poor, 5=very poor, and 6=not applicable. The changes in these features would show how the community's CBD has changed since the inception of their CBD revitalization program. However it is important to note that there are other economic factors which can attribute to

these changes. Changes in state, national, and local economies can directly affect a community's CBD. Some of these changes are a result of community reinvestment and dedication to their CBD revitalization program.

Many CBD revitalization programs focus on improving the retail or service sector of the community and on rehabilitating historic structures in a community. This is apparent with the first community feature rated: Existing downtown employment base for daytime retail and restaurant market. During the initial year of the CBD revitalization program responses were fairly evenly spread across good (22.9 percent), fair (25.6 percent), poor (20 percent), and very poor (22.9 percent). With the revitalization program in operation the downtown employment base for daytime retail and restaurant market made an improvement where most responses (54.3 percent) were rated good by communities, followed by fair (20 percent). Very good was the next largest group at 8.6 percent and poor, very poor, and n/a all representing an equal number of communities at 5.7 percent.

The majority of communities in Oklahoma are not of a scale large enough to support a public transportation system, however improvements to public transportation systems can improve the traffic to the downtown for a community with such a system. A majority of communities indicated that they did not have a public transportation system in their community at their program initiation (57 percent) and in 1995 (51.3 percent). Of the 13 communities with public transportation at the time of their program initiation, one (2.9 percent) rated their transportation access as good, four (11.5 percent) rated their systems as fair, two (5.7 percent) rated their system as poor

and six (17.2 percent) rated their public transportation access as very poor.

There were slight improvements in public transportation system access in 1995. Two (5.7 percent) communities rates their transportation access as good, five (14.3 percent) rated their transportation system access as fair, two (5.7 percent) rated access to public transportation as very poor, and four (11.5 percent) rated access to public transportation as very poor. There was an increase in the number of non-responses, two in the initial year and four in 1995.

Traditionally a problem with downtowns has been the lack of adequate parking space. Despite this historic trend the majority of responding communities (68.5 percent) rated their parking facilities as fair or better. Three communities (8.6 percent) rated their facilities as very good, 10 communities (28.6 percent) rated their facilities as good, and 11 communities (31.3 percent) rated their parking facilities as fair. Nine communities (25.8 percent) gave their parking facilities a non-satisfactory rating of poor or worse. Five communities (14.3 percent) rated their facilities as poor and four communities (11.5 percent) as very poor. After there was a revitalization program in place, there were some improvements in parking facilities in 1995. The majority of responding communities that rated their parking facilities as fair or better increased from 24 to 30 (from 68.5 percent to 85.7 percent) communities. There were three (8.6 percent) communities which rated their parking facilities as very good, 11 communities (31.3 percent) who rated their facilities as good, 16 communities (45.8 percent) rated their facilities as fair. The number of communities which had facilities which rated poor or worse dropped to one (2.9 percent)

community and it rated its facilities as very poor.

Communities were asked to rate their retail base. Improvements to the retail base of communities were expected with the revitalization program, because many revitalization programs focus on improving the retail sector of a community's economy. There was an improvement in the retail base of responding communities from the time of program initiation to 1995. At the time of program initiation one community (2.9 percent) rated their retail base as very good, two communities (5.7 percent) rated their retail base as good, 12 communities (34.3 percent) rated their retail base as fair, six communities (17.1 percent) rated their retail base as poor, and 12 communities (34.3 percent) rated their retail base as very poor. In 1995 the number of communities rating their retail base as very good remained constant at one (2.9 percent). Most of the improved communities rated their retail base in the good category, 13 communities (37.2 percent). The number of fair retail based communities dropped to 11 (31.3 percent), as did the number of communities which rated their CBD as poor, four (11.5 percent). The largest decline of unfavorable retail base rating occurred with the communities that rated their base as very poor with two communities (2.9 percent) rating their retail base as very poor in 1995.

Communities were asked to rate various housing bases in or near their downtown. There was a moderate improvement in the low-moderate income housing base with 19 (54.3 percent) communities rating their base as fair or better in the initial year of their CBD revitalization program. That number increased to 23 (65.7 percent) in 1995. Many communities indicated that this question did not apply to

them, six (17.1 percent) in the initial year and seven (20 percent) in 1995. In the initial year many communities (42.8 percent) rated their low-moderate income housing base as fair and four (11.5 percent) rated it as good.

In 1995 communities rating their low-moderate housing base as fair increased to 17 (48.5 percent) with one (2.9 percent) rating it as very good and five (14.3 percent) rating it as good. The number of poor ratings declined to two communities (5.7 percent) with only one community (2.9 percent) rating their low-moderate income housing base as very poor.

Middle-upper income housing did not make as significant improvement as lower-middle housing base. During the initial year 14 communities (40.2 percent) with a middle-upper income housing base rated as fair or better. That number improved by one to 15 (42.8 percent) in 1995. Communities who rated their middle-upper income housing base as very good remained constant at one (2.9 percent) for both time periods as did the number of communities which rated the base as good remain constant at three (8.6 percent). The number of communities which rated the housing base as poor declined from nine (25.6 percent) in the initial year to eight (22.9 percent) in 1995. Also declining were the number of communities which rated their middle-upper housing base as very poor, six (17.1 percent) in the initial year and three (8.6 percent) in 1995. The number of non responses increased by three for the 1995 section.

Downtown revitalization efforts in Oklahoma communities typically try to improve the local economy by improving the retail sector of a community. These

revitalization efforts also try to protect the historical characteristics of a community. Locally initiated revitalization efforts are sometimes started to protect or save a historic structure and spread through much of a community. Communities responding to the survey indicated their focus on historical structures with the preservation of historical buildings which offer a unique development potential. Communities were asked to rate their stock of historic buildings which offer a unique development potential. Many of the communities responding to the survey indicated that they had buildings of a historic nature which had the capability of being renovated for business use at the time of their program initiation. Seven communities (20 percent) rated their historic building's development potential as very good. This number increased to 10 communities (28.6 percent) in 1995. Ten communities (28.6 percent) rated their historic building's development potential as good, 13 communities (37.1 percent) rated them as good in 1995. Ten communities (28.6 percent) rating their buildings development potential as fair during the initial year and 6 (17.1 percent) in 1995. Four communities (11.5 percent) in the initial year and two communities (5.7 percent) rated their historic building development potential as poor. Two communities (5.7 percent) rated their building's development potential as very poor in their initial year and none in 1995.

Improvements to public space (infrastructure) was evident when communities were asked to rate the physical condition of sidewalks and infrastructure at the time of their program initialization and in 1995. A majority of communities (62.9 percent) rated their sidewalks and infrastructure as poor or very poor, with six rating them as

poor and 16 as very poor. The number of communities which rated their sidewalks and infrastructure as fair or better improved from their program's initial year to 1995. During the initial year eight communities (22.9 percent) rated their sidewalks as fair and four (11.5 percent) rated them as good. In 1995 there was a more even distribution of communities across the scale indicating some improvements to infrastructure and sidewalks. In 1995, seven communities (20 percent) rated their sidewalks as very good and seven communities (20 percent) rated them as very poor. Five communities (14.3 percent) rated their side walks and infrastructure as good and five communities (14.3 percent) rated them as poor. Seven communities (20 percent) rated their infrastructure as fair.

Communities were asked to rate the physical condition of their downtown. During the initial year of their CBD revitalization program, five communities (14.3 percent) rated their downtown's condition as very good, 12 communities (34.4 percent) as good, six communities (17.1 percent) as fair, 11 communities (31.4 percent) as poor, and one community (2.8 percent) as very poor. In 1995, no community rated the physical condition of their downtown as very good, 16 communities (45.7 percent) rated it as good, with 10 communities (28.6 percent) rating it as fair, two communities (5.7 percent) rating it as poor, and two communities (5.7 percent) rating it as very poor. The total number of communities with a downtown in a condition of fair or better increased by three from the initial year to 1995, however there was an increase of one community in rating downtown's condition as very poor.

Along with improvements of the physical downtown, the image of the downtown improved as well from the time a program was initiated. During the initial year of a CBD program, no community rated its downtown's image as very good. In 1995, four communities (11.5 percent) rated their downtown's image as very good. During the initial year four (11.5 percent) rated their downtown as good, while in 1995 that number increased to 16 (45.7 percent). There were eight communities (22.9 percent) during the initial year and seven communities (20 percent) which rated their downtown's image as fair. Eight communities (22.9 percent) rated their image as poor during the initial year of their program and only one (2.8 percent) rated it as poor in 1995. Thirteen communities rated their downtown's image as very poor at the initial year of their CBD revitalization program and in 1995 that number dropped to two communities (5.7 percent).

Communities were asked to rate their private sector organizations. During the initial year: four communities (11.5 percent) rated them as very good, 12 communities (34.4 percent) rated them as good, 11 communities (31.3 percent) rated them as fair, four communities (11.5 percent) rated them as poor, and one community (2.8 percent) rated them as very poor. In 1995, seven communities (20 percent) rated them as very good, 17 communities (48.6 percent) rated them as good, three communities (8.6 percent) percent rated them as fair, one community (2.8 percent) rated them as poor, and one community (2.8 percent) rated them as very poor.

Attempts to recruit new businesses and stabilize existing ones, in an attempt to strengthen a CBD, is a vital part of a revitalization program's success. This goal of

communities is evident with the improvements communities made in their public sector incentives for commercial revitalization. During the initial year of their revitalization program only one community (2.8 percent) rated their incentives program as very good, five communities (14.3 percent) rated it as good, seven communities (20 percent) as fair, nine communities (25.7 percent) as poor, and eight communities (22.9 percent) as very poor. In 1995, five communities (14.3 percent) rated their incentives program as very good, 10 communities (28.5 percent) rated it as good, seven communities (20 percent) as fair, three communities (8.6 percent) as poor, and three communities (8.6 percent) as very poor.

Revitalization programs have also increased the number of public-private partnerships in responding communities. During the initial year of the revitalization programs, three communities (8.6 percent) rated their partnerships as very good, five communities (14.3 percent) rated them as good, five communities (14.3 percent) rated them as fair, eight communities (22.9 percent) rated them as poor, seven communities (20 percent) rated them as very poor and six communities (17.1 percent) indicated not applicable. During 1995, nine communities (25.7 percent) rated their partnerships as very good, 10 communities (28.6 percent) rated them as good, six communities (17.1 percent) rated them as fair, one community (2.8 percent) rated them as poor, one community (2.8 percent) rated them as very poor and four communities (11.5 percent) selected not applicable.

TABLE 23
**Rate the following features of your CBD at the initial Year of your
revitalization program and in 1995.**

CBD features:

Existing downtown employment base for daytime retail and restaurant market

	<u>Response</u>			
	<u>Initial Year</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1 Very Good	1	2.9	3	8.6
2 Good	8	22.9	19	54.3
3 Fair	9	25.6	7	20.0
4 Poor	7	20.0	0	0
5 Very Poor	8	22.9	2	5.7
6 Not Applicable	2	5.7	2	5.7
No Response	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>5.7</u>
Total	35	100.0	35	100.0

Public transportation access to a large portion of city population

	<u>Response</u>			
	<u>Initial Year</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1 Very Good	0	0	0	0
2 Good	1	2.9	2	5.7
3 Fair	4	11.5	5	14.3
4 Poor	2	5.7	2	5.7
5 Very Poor	6	17.2	4	11.5
6 Not Applicable	20	57.0	18	51.3
No Response	<u>2</u>	<u>5.7</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>11.5</u>
Total	35	100.0	35	100.0

TABLE 23 (continued)
**Rate the following features of your CBD at the initial Year of your
revitalization program and in 1995.**

Parking facilities

	<u>Response</u>			<u>Response</u>	
	<u>Initial Year</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>Percent</u>	
1 Very Good	3	8.6	3	8.6	
2 Good	10	28.6	11	31.3	
3 Fair	11	31.3	16	45.8	
4 Poor	5	14.3	0	0	
5 Very Poor	4	11.5	1	2.9	
6 Not Applicable	2	5.7	2	5.7	
No Response	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>5.7</u>	
Total	35	100.0	35	100.0	

Retail base

	<u>Response</u>			<u>Response</u>	
	<u>Initial Year</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>Percent</u>	
1 Very Good	1	2.9	1	2.9	
2 Good	2	5.7	13	37.2	
3 Fair	12	34.3	11	31.3	
4 Poor	6	17.1	4	11.5	
5 Very Poor	12	34.3	2	5.7	
6 Not Applicable	2	5.7	2	5.7	
No Response	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>5.7</u>	
Total	35	100.0	35	100.0	

TABLE 23 (continued)
**Rate the following features of your CBD at the initial Year of your
revitalization program and in 1995.**

Low moderate income housing base (in or near downtown)

	<u>Response</u>			
	<u>Initial Year</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1 Very Good	0	0	1	2.9
2 Good	4	11.5	5	14.3
3 Fair	15	42.8	17	48.5
4 Poor	5	14.3	2	5.7
5 Very Poor	5	14.3	1	2.9
6 Not Applicable	6	17.1	7	20.0
No Response	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>5.7</u>
Total	35	100.0	35	100.0

Middle-upper income housing base (in or near downtown)

	<u>Response</u>			
	<u>Initial Year</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1 Very Good	1	2.9	1	2.9
2 Good	3	8.6	3	8.6
3 Fair	10	28.7	11	31.3
4 Poor	9	25.6	8	22.9
5 Very Poor	6	17.1	3	8.6
6 Not Applicable	6	17.1	6	17.1
No Response	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>8.6</u>
Total	35	100.0	35	100.0

TABLE 23 (continued)
**Rate the following features of your CBD at the initial Year of your
revitalization program and in 1995.**

Historic buildings offering unique development potential

	<u>Response</u>			
	<u>Initial Year</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1 Very Good	7	20.0	10	28.6
2 Good	10	28.6	13	37.1
3 Fair	10	28.6	6	17.1
4 Poor	4	11.5	2	5.7
5 Very Poor	2	5.7	0	0
6 Not Applicable	1	2.8	1	2.9
No Response	<u>1</u>	<u>2.8</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>8.6</u>
Total	35	100.0	35	100.0

Physical condition of sidewalks and infrastructure

	<u>Response</u>			
	<u>Initial Year</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1 Very Good	0	0	7	20.0
2 Good	4	11.5	5	14.3
3 Fair	8	22.9	7	20.0
4 Poor	6	17.1	5	14.3
5 Very Poor	16	45.7	7	20.0
6 Not Applicable	1	2.8	1	2.8
No Response	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>8.6</u>
Total	35	100.0	35	100.0

TABLE 23 (continued)
**Rate the following features of your CBD at the initial Year of your
revitalization program and in 1995.**

Physical condition of downtown

	<u>Response</u>			
	<u>Initial Year</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1 Very Good	5	14.3	0	0
2 Good	12	34.4	16	45.7
3 Fair	6	17.1	10	28.6
4 Poor	11	31.4	2	5.7
5 Very Poor	1	2.8	2	5.7
6 Not Applicable	0	0	1	2.8
No Response	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>11.5</u>
Total	35	100.0	35	100.0

Image of central business district

	<u>Response</u>			
	<u>Initial Year</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1 Very Good	0	0	4	11.5
2 Good	4	11.5	16	45.7
3 Fair	8	22.9	7	20.0
4 Poor	8	22.9	1	2.8
5 Very Poor	13	37.1	2	5.7
6 Not Applicable	1	2.8	1	2.8
No Response	<u>1</u>	<u>2.8</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>11.5</u>
Total	35	100.0	35	100.0

TABLE 23 (continued)
**Rate the following features of your CBD at the initial Year of your
revitalization program and in 1995.**

Private sector organizations (civic organizations)

	<u>Response</u>			
	<u>Initial Year</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1 Very Good	4	11.5	7	20.0
2 Good	12	34.4	17	48.6
3 Fair	11	31.3	3	8.6
4 Poor	4	11.5	1	2.8
5 Very Poor	1	2.8	1	2.8
6 Not Applicable	2	5.7	2	5.7
No Response	<u>1</u>	<u>2.8</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>11.5</u>
Total	35	100.0	35	100.0

Public sector incentives for commercial revitalization

	<u>Response</u>			
	<u>Initial Year</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1 Very Good	1	2.8	5	14.3
2 Good	5	14.3	10	28.5
3 Fair	7	20.0	7	20.0
4 Poor	9	25.7	3	8.6
5 Very Poor	8	22.9	3	8.6
6 Not Applicable	3	8.6	2	5.7
No Response	<u>2</u>	<u>5.7</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>14.3</u>
Total	35	100.0	35	100.0

TABLE 23 (continued)
**Rate the following features of your CBD at the initial Year of your
revitalization program and in 1995.**

Public-private partnerships

	<u>Initial Year</u>	<u>Response</u> <u>Percent</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1 Very Good	3	8.6	9	25.7
2 Good	5	14.3	10	28.6
3 Fair	5	14.3	6	17.1
4 Poor	8	22.9	1	2.8
5 Very Poor	7	20.0	1	2.8
6 Not Applicable	6	17.1	4	11.5
No Response	<u>1</u>	<u>2.8</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>11.5</u>
Total	35	100.0	35	100.0

Program Funding

During the initial year of the CBD revitalization program, the average annual budget was \$41,894 per community. This average amount dropped to \$38,318 per community for 1995. There was one community (3.4 percent) with an initial year budget under \$10,000 (Table 24). Nine communities (31 percent) had initial annual program budgets in the \$10,001-25,000 range. The largest group of responding communities, 11 (37.9 percent), had annual budgets of \$25,001-50,000 during their initial year. Four communities (13.7 percent) had budgets in the \$50,001-75,000 range during their initial year. There were two communities (7 percent) with budgets in the \$75,001-100,000 range and two communities (7 percent) over \$100,000 in their initial year. In 1995, three communities (10.4 percent) had budgets under \$10,000. Seven communities (24.1 percent) had budgets in the \$10,001-25,000 range. Nine communities (31 percent) had budgets in the \$25,001-50,000 range. Seven communities (24.1 percent) had budgets in the \$50,001-75,000 range. No communities had budgets in the \$75,001-100,000 range for 1995, however there were three communities (10.4 percent) with budgets over \$100,000.

TABLE 24
**To the nearest \$1,000, what was the size of the CBD revitalization program's
operating budget in its initial year and in 1995?**

Initial Year	Response	Percent
Range		
0-10,000	1	3.5
10,001-25,000	9	31.0
25,001-50,000	11	37.9
50,001-75,000	4	13.8
75,001-100,000	2	6.9
100,000+	2	6.9
Totals	29	100.0

Average Budget Size - Initial Year \$41,894

In 1995	Response	Percent
Range		
0-10,000	3	10.4
10,001-25,000	7	24.1
25,001-50,000	9	31.0
50,001-75,000	7	24.1
75,001-100,000	0	0.0
100,000+	3	10.4
Totals	29	100.0

Average Budget Size - 1995 \$38,318

A list of funding sources is provided in Table 25. This list provides some insight about where communities seek assistance for the operation of their CBD revitalization program.

TABLE 25
Program Funding Sources (as percent of budget) for the Initial Year

Initial Year:	Percent
Local	31.7
County/regional	0.2
State	0
Federal	0
<u>Other</u>	<u>0</u>
Total Public Funding	31.9
Businesses in CBD	32.3
Businesses outside CBD	11.4
Foundations	9.0
Fees	0
Residents	12.2
Industry in the community	2.2
<u>Other</u>	<u>2.2</u>
Total Private Funding	69.3
In 1995	
Local	32.9
County/regional	0.2
State	0
Federal	0
<u>Other</u>	<u>5.7</u>
Total Public Funding	38.8
Businesses in CBD	38.6
Businesses outside CBD	10.3
Foundations	0.7
Fees	0.3
Residents	5.4
Industry in the community	3.6
<u>Other</u>	<u>2.3</u>
Total Private Funding	61.2

Table 26 provided responding communities with a selection of areas which their CBD revitalization program might emphasize. Communities were asked to select areas which their CBD revitalization program placed an emphasis and rate their programs's success in that area. They are given a scale (1=very good, 2=good,

3=fair, 4=poor, 5=very poor, and 6=not applicable) to rate their program's success in these areas. Non responses and not applicable selections are assumed to represent communities which did not place any emphasis in selected areas. The horizontal row for Table 26 will sum to 35, the number of communities responding to the second survey. Areas of program emphasis which were rated as very good and good as well as very poor and poor follow. The top seven areas in each group are listed with the number of communities which rated that area indicated.

Areas which rated good or very good were:

1. Improvement of the Image of Downtown with 23 responses
2. Special Community Events Downtown with 22 responses
3. Physical Improvements of Buildings with 21 responses
4. New Construction Activity with 21 responses
5. Volunteer Involvement with 20 responses
6. Retail Events Downtown with 18 responses
7. Tax Revenue Generation with 17 responses

Areas which rated very poor or poor were:

1. Downtown cleanliness with 5 responses
2. Physical Improvements of Buildings with 4 responses
3. Physical Improvements of Public Buildings and Space with 4 responses
4. New Construction Activity with 4 responses
5. New Business Recruitment with 4 responses
6. Property Development Recruitment with 4 responses
7. Improvement of Sidewalks and Curbs with 4 responses.

TABLE 26
Program emphasis areas and success.

	<u>Very Good</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Very Poor</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>No Response</u>
Physical Improvement of buildings	10	11	6	4	0	1	3
Availability of Building Rehabilitation							
Finance	2	11	6	2	1	4	9
Physical Improvement of Public							
Building or Space	10	6	4	4	0	4	7
New Construction Activity	10	11	6	4	0	1	3
Building and Property Sales	7	11	6	1	1	2	7
Availability of Building Construction							
Finance	0	4	3	1	2	5	20
Parking or Traffic Improvements	2	6	9	1	0	3	14
Improvements to Sidewalks and Curbs	6	6	6	3	1	3	10
Downtown Cleanliness	3	13	7	5	0	1	6
New Business Recruitment	4	11	6	4	0	2	8
Business Retention	1	11	8	1	1	3	10
Property Developer Recruitment	0	5	3	0	4	4	19
Delivery of Municipal Services	2	6	2	0	1	5	19
Public Safety	1	8	2	0	1	4	19
Municipal Attitude	7	7	3	1	1	3	13
Improvement of the Image of Downtown	8	15	3	0	0	3	6
Improvement of Retail Shop Variety							
Downtown	4	10	9	2	1	3	6
Retention or Creation of Specialty							
Retail District downtown	4	4	7	2	1	4	13
Special Community Events Downtown	11	11	6	0	0	0	7
Retail Events Downtown	4	14	4	1	1	2	9
Public Relations for Downtown							
Businesses	4	12	7	2	0	0	10
Job Creation	5	9	5	1	1	2	12
Tax Revenue Generation	5	12	2	1	1	1	13
Control Over Economic Growth	0	7	8	0	0	2	18
Civic Leadership	6	9	4	0	1	1	14
Public Attitude	5	11	8	2	0	0	9
Volunteer Involvement	6	14	8	1	0	0	6
Strategic Planning Process/Workplan	4	11	8	2	0	0	10
Organizational Development	4	11	7	2	0	0	11

Table 27 contains a list of activities which can assist a CBD revitalization program in addressing areas of chosen emphasis. Communities were asked to select from this list which activities they used to assist their program. The results are reported in Table 27. The most utilized activities are: Initial assessment of community needs or conditions with 85.7 percent of the communities using this activity. Promotion-image guiding and special events also was used by 85.7 percent of the responding communities as was design that enhances visual appeal. Strategic planning or work plan development was also a heavily utilized activity with 83.3 percent of the responding communities using this activity to assist their CBD revitalization program. Partnering with other organizations is another useful activity which was used by 80 percent of the responding communities.

TABLE 27
Activities that assist the CBD revitalization program in addressing areas of emphasis.

<u>Activities</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Initial assessment of community needs or conditions.	30	85.7
Partnering with other organizations.	28	80.0
Promotion-image guiding and special events.	30	85.7
Strategic planning or work plan development.	25	83.3
Design that enhances visual appeal of CBD.	30	85.7
Needs update or program evaluation.	21	60.0
Business assistance services (e.g. technical assistance, architectural services).	24	68.6
Business and or developer recruitment.	18	51.4
Major new development project.	14	40.0
Rehabilitation financing and promotion.	19	54.3
Public infrastructure construction or rehabilitation	21	60.0
Upgrading of city services (e.g. permit process, city street, cleaning, lighting).	23	65.7
Incentive programs.	21	60.0
Market analysis.	15	42.9
Other:	1	2.9

Assessing the needs of a community should be an initial step in the implementation of a CBD revitalization program. Communities need to evaluate the condition of their downtown to determine why there has been a decline in activity and what can be done to resolve this decline. A needs assessment is designed to communicate to community leaders the problems perceived by residents and shoppers. Communities that performed a needs or condition assessment were asked to indicate which areas were covered by the assessment. Table 28 reports the responses to this question. The area most addresses by an assessment was Town meeting/visioning, which was covered by 24 communities (68.6 percent). The next two most covered areas were Traffic/parking study covered by 20 communities (57.1 percent) and Building condition assessments covered by 20 communities (57.1 percent). This would be consistent with trying to solve the problems of downtown's image, downtown's traffic access, and the physical appearance of the downtown area. Nineteen communities (54.3 percent) covered Business surveys or visitation program in their needs assessment. Historic preservation inventory was covered by 17 communities (48.6 percent) as was Infrastructure and city services, 17 communities (48.6 percent). An economic analysis was part of 10 communities (28.6 percent) needs assessments. A Resident survey was conducted by nine communities (25.7 percent), three communities (8.6 percent) conducted a market trade analysis.

TABLE 28
If you performed a needs or conditions assessment, which of the following areas were covered?

<u>Areas</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Traffic/parking Study	20	57.1
Historic preservation inventory	17	48.6
Business surveys or visitation program	19	54.3
Resident survey	9	25.7
Economic analysis	10	28.6
Town meeting/visioning	24	68.6
Building condition assessments	20	57.1
Infrastructure and city services	17	48.6
Other areas:*	3	8.6

* **Other area:**
Market trade area analysis

Communities were asked what obstacles they have encountered in the initialization and current operation of their CBD revitalization program. Funding appears to be the most common obstacle for a community in the operation of their CBD program, both in the initial year and in 1995 (Table 29). Inadequate public funding for program was the most common obstacle during the initial year of CBD program operations with 12 communities (34.3 percent) indicating this was a problem. The second most common obstacle was inadequate private funding for the program with 11 communities (31.4 percent) having this problem in their initial year. During the initial year six communities (17.1 percent) had problems with the lack of private support. Six communities (17.1 percent) also faced a low level of political support during their initial year. Three communities (8.6 percent) had a failure of a specific project in their program. Three communities (8.6 percent) also faced community

opposition. Only one community (2.9 percent) had problems with poor CBD revitalization management during their initial year.

Funding again is the most common problem for communities in 1995. Inadequate private funding for program was the most common problem, faced by 16 communities (45.7 percent) with inadequate public funding being next, faced by 13 communities (37.1 percent). Following funding problems is a lack of private participation (volunteers) with eight communities (22.9 percent) having this problem. This could be occurring because the 'new' is beginning to wear off of the program. As the program begins to experience some success, previous volunteers might feel complacent with the current level of success facing the program. Program managers need to emphasize to volunteer groups that the revitalization effort is a continuous process which relies heavily on volunteer support. Similar to their initial year, seven communities (20 percent) face a low level of political support in 1995. In 1995 the number of communities experiencing a failure of a specific project in their program grew from one to six communities (17.1 percent). Community opposition has declined from three to one community (2.9 percent), and the number of communities with poor management of the CBD revitalization program increased to two communities (5.7 percent).

TABLE 29
**Indicate obstacles that have caused problems in implementing the CBD
revitalization program for both the initial year and 1995.**

<u>Obstacles</u>	<u>Initial Year Response</u>	<u>Initial Year Percent</u>	<u>1995 Response</u>	<u>1995 Percent</u>
Inadequate public funding for program	12	34.3	13	37.1
Inadequate private funding for program	11	31.4	16	45.7
Lack of private participation (volunteers)	6	17.1	8	22.9
Low level of political support	6	17.1	7	20.0
Community opposition	3	8.6	1	2.9
Poor management of CBD revitalization program	1	2.9	2	5.7
Failure of specific project in program	3	8.6	6	17.1
Other:*	4	11.4	4	11.4

*** Other Obstacles:**

Perceived as a merchant's organization and not a broad based community
organization
Staff shortage
Lack of visual changes
Lack of cooperation from city government
Never enough money
Too many bureaucratic rules to take out a loan
Burn out of key players

Communities were asked what type of incentives were available to firms that locate in their CBD (Table 30). Twenty communities (57.1 percent) offer a low interest loan pool financed by a local financial institution. Fourteen communities (40 percent) offer a local grant program usually designed to aid with building renovation expenses. Eight communities (22.9 percent) offer a historic tax credit. Five communities (14.3 percent) acquired ISTEAs assistance and two communities (5.7 percent) offer some sort of venture capital.

TABLE 30
Business/program incentives available to firms that locate in your CBD.

<u>Incentives</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number of Firms</u>
Venture Capital	2	5.7	1
Low interest loan pools by local financial institutions	20	57.1	60
Local grant programs (i.e. facade, sign, interior)	14	40.0	109
Historic tax credits (federal)	8	22.9	6
ISTEA ⁽¹⁾	5	14.3	11
Other:	0	0	0

⁽¹⁾ Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991

Sometimes interest in rehabilitating one building or structure is enough to spark interest in forming a CBD revitalization program. Major development projects also may initiate revitalization efforts and vice versa. Communities were asked if a major private or public development project was centrally important to their CBD revitalization program. The majority of communities, 27 communities (77.1 percent) did not have such a project (Table 31). Only seven communities (20 percent) has a project central to their CBD revitalization project.

TABLE 31
Was a major private or public development project (e.g. hotel, convention center, office complex, etc) central to the CBD revitalization program?

	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes*	7	20.0
No	27	77.1
No Response	<u>1</u>	<u>2.9</u>
Total	35	100.0

***If yes, describe the type of development project:**

Rebuilding one block destroyed by fire in 1992-In heart of downtown

Sidewalk replacement via ISTEA grant

Community center

Council House Museum-\$1 million restoration

Constantine Center-a theater

Restored historic theater/community performance center

McClain County Courthouse expansion

CBD/downtown Image Control

Once a revitalization project is in place some sort of design control may be required to regulate new construction and review alterations to ensure they maintain the historic flavor of the community. Thirteen communities (37.1 percent) have a review board or historic commission which reviews alterations and new construction (Table 32). The majority of communities, 19 (54.3 percent), do not have a review board.

TABLE 32

Does a review board or historic commission (other than a planning, or zoning board) review alterations and new construction to ensure that they are compatible with the image of the CBD?

	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes*	13	37.1
No	19	54.3
No Response	<u>3</u>	<u>8.6</u>
Total	35	100.0

***If yes, describe:**

CBD board reviews recommends

Main street design committee

Main street facade renovation loan committee

City permit process requires historic commission review for approval

A city commission

Design committee and historic preservation commission

Design committee

Historic preservation commission

Design committee reviews

Main street design committee and Ponca City historic preservation council

Main street Prague-design committee

Main street design committee

Of the 35 communities responding to the second survey, nine communities (25.7 percent) have a historic ordinance, 23 communities (65.7 percent) do not have a historic ordinance (Table 33). A historic ordinance is one control method used for regulating the appearance of structures being refurbished or newly constructed in the downtown area.

TABLE 33
Does historic district ordinance exists in the CBD?

	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	9	25.7
No	23	65.7
No Response	<u>3</u>	<u>8.6</u>
Total	35	100.0

Beyond historic ordinances there are other regulatory ordinances which can be used to control design changes. Ten communities (28.6 percent) responding to the second survey have such ordinances which control design changes (Table 34). There were 15 communities (42.8 percent) which did not have these ordinances. There were 10 "no responses" to this question.

TABLE 34
Aside from historic district ordinances, are there any local ordinances that control design changes?

	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes*	10	28.6
No	15	42.8
No Response	<u>10</u>	<u>28.6</u>
Total	35	100.0

*** If yes, list ordinances:**

Sign ordinances	Design plan
Sign regulations in downtown	Signage
Town ordinance	Sign ordinance

A community's CBD revitalization program can entice property owners to make upgrades to their facilities by offering design assistance, both financial and non-financial. The majority of responding communities, 25 (71.4 percent), indicated their revitalization program offers some type of non-financial design assistance (Table 35). Seven communities do not offer non-financial design assistance. Financial design assistance was offered by 15 communities (42.9 percent). This financial design assistance was targeted for making changes to facades, windows, and signs. Nineteen of the communities (54.3 percent) did not offer financial design assistance in their CBD revitalization program. From the initialization of the CBD revitalization programs in these communities, there have been many businesses utilizing the design assistance of programs to make changes to their businesses. Table 35 shows the number of businesses which have made changes to their facades, windows, signs, etc. Twelve communities (42.9 percent) indicated that they have had 1-10 businesses in their CBD make design changes since the inception of their CBD revitalization program. Four communities (14.3 percent) have had 11-20 businesses make design changes in their CBD. Two communities (7.1 percent) have had 21-30 businesses make design changes to their buildings in their CBD. Two communities (7.1 percent) have had 31-40 businesses make design changes to their buildings. Five communities (17.9 percent) have had 41-50 businesses make design changes to their buildings in their CBD. Two communities (7.1 percent) have had 50-100 businesses make design changes to their buildings in their CBD, and one community (3.6 percent) has had over 100 businesses make design changes to buildings in their CBD.

TABLE 35
Does the CBD revitalization program provide non-financial design assistance to merchants, property owners, etc?

	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	25	71.4
No	7	20.0
No Response	<u>3</u>	<u>8.6</u>
Total	35	100.0

Does the CBD revitalization program offer financial design assistance targeted for making changes to facades, windows, and signs?

	<u>Response</u>	
<u>Percent</u>		
Yes	15	42.9
No	19	54.3
No Response	<u>1</u>	<u>2.8</u>
Total	35	100.0

Since the CBD revitalization program began, approximately how many businesses in the CBD have made design changes to facades, windows, signs, etc.?

	<u>Response</u>	
<u>Percent</u>		
1-10	12	42.9
11-20	4	14.3
21-30	2	7.1
31-40	2	7.1
41-50	5	17.9
50-100	2	7.1
over 100	<u>1</u>	<u>3.6</u>
Total	28	100.0

Program Relations, Sales events, and Festivals

Development of a public relations campaign is important to relate to a community the goals of a CBD revitalization program. A majority of responding communities, 26 (74.3 percent), developed a public relations campaign as part of their

CBD revitalization campaign (Table 36). Initially the primary audience of the campaign was mainly local businesses (45 percent), followed by residents (33.3 percent). This would seem to suggest the importance of local support from the community and business sector if a CBD program is going to be successful. Prospective businesses/developers were the next largest group targeted (18.4 percent) followed by tourist (3.3 percent). In 1995 the order of audiences remained the same with the largest targeted group being local businesses (29.3 percent) followed by residents (26.8 percent). Prospective businesses/developers (23.2 percent) and tourist (20.7 percent) were the last two groups targeted by the public relations campaign.

TABLE 36
Was a public relations (P.R.) campaign developed as a major part of the
CBD revitalization program?

	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes ⁽¹⁾	26	74.3
No	6	17.1
No Response	<u>3</u>	<u>8.6</u>
Total	35	100.0

⁽¹⁾ If yes, who were the primary audiences during the initial year and in 1995?

	<u>Initial Yr.</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Residents	20	33.3	22	26.8
Tourists	2	3.3	17	20.7
Local Businesses	27	45.0	24	29.3
Prospective Business/Deveiopers	<u>11</u>	<u>18.4</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>23.2</u>
Total	60	100	82	100.0

Coordinated retail sales events are a part of many responding communities CBD revitalization programs. Twenty five communities (71.4 percent) have coordinated retail sales events as part of their CBD revitalization program (Table 37).

In 1995 there were 10 communities that had 1-2 sales events, seven communities had 3-4 sales events, three communities had 5-6 sales events, and three communities had 7-8 sales events.

TABLE 37
Are coordinated retail sales events part of the current
CBD revitalization program?

	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes ⁽¹⁾	25	71.4
No	9	25.7
No Response	<u>1</u>	<u>2.9</u>
Total	35	100.0

⁽¹⁾ If yes, how many retail sales events did the CBD revitalization program coordinate in 1995?

	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1-2	10	43.5
3-4	7	30.5
5-6	3	13.0
7-8	<u>3</u>	<u>13.0</u>
Total	23	100.0

Average number of events=3

How many of these events are annual?

	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1-2	11	55.0
3-4	6	30.0
5-6	2	10.0
7-8	<u>1</u>	<u>5.0</u>
Total	20	100.0

Average number of annual events=3

Along with coordinated sales events, festivals are a big part of a community's CBD program. Festivals are used to promote the image of downtown, attract new shoppers/tourist, bring people to the downtown area for social gatherings, and to

celebrate the community's heritage. Twenty eight of the communities (80 percent) have some sort of festival as part of their CBD revitalization program (Table 38). The majority of respondents (80.8 percent) had 1-2 festivals in 1995. Five communities (19.2 percent) had 3-4 festivals in 1995. About 84 percent of the (1-2) festivals are annual. Sixteen percent of the (3-4) festivals are annual. Half of the largest festivals attract a crowd of 1,501-5,000 people. Two communities (8.3 percent) attract between 10,001-15,000 people to their largest festival and one community attracts more than 20,000 people to its largest festival.

TABLE 38
Are festivals part of the CBD revitalization program?

	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes ⁽¹⁾	28	80.0
No	6	17.1
No Response	<u>1</u>	<u>2.9</u>
Total	35	100.0

⁽¹⁾ If yes, how many festivals did the CBD revitalization program coordinates in 1995?

<u>Festivals</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1-2	21	80.8
3-4	5	19.2
5-6	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	26	100.0

Average number of annual events=2

How many of these events are annual?

<u>Festivals</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1-2	21	84.0
3-4	4	16.0
5-6	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	25	100.0

Average number of annual events=2

TABLE 38 (continued)
Are festivals part of the CBD revitalization program?

Estimate attendance at the largest festival in 1995	<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
0-500	3	12.5
501-1,500	3	12.5
1,501-5,000	12	50.0
5,001-10,000	2	8.3
10,001-15,000	2	8.3
15,001-20,000	1	4.2
Above 20,000	<u>1</u>	<u>4.2</u>
Total	24	100.0
Average attendance=6,400		

Program Benefits and Management Characteristics

Communities were given four categories to indicate how they have changed since the CBD revitalization program began. They were asked to indicate if the number of jobs in their CBD has increased, decreased, or remained the same. The majority of communities (77.1 percent) saw an increase in the number of jobs in their CBD from the beginning of their CBD program (Table 39). Few communities (5.7 percent) saw a decrease in the number of jobs and 14.3 percent saw no change. Communities were asked to indicate the same for the number of businesses in their CBD. Again the majority of communities (74.3 percent) indicated that they had an increase in the number of businesses since the beginning of their CBD program. Few communities (5.7 percent) had a decline in businesses and 17.1 percent had the number of businesses remain the same. When asked about the average rent for commercial lease space in their CBD, a majority of communities (60 percent) indicated they have had an increase in the rental rate of commercial space. Only 5.7 percent of the communities had a decline in their rental rate for commercial space in

their CBD and 28.6 percent did not have any change in their rental rates. Occupancy rates have increased for the majority of responding communities (71.4 percent). Again only 5.7 percent of the communities saw a decrease in their occupancy rates for buildings in their CBD and 14.3 percent did not have a change in their CBD's occupancy rate.

TABLE 39
Indicate how the following categories have changed since the initial year of your CBD revitalization program to 1995.

	<u>Increasing (%)</u>		<u>Decreasing (%)</u>		<u>No Change (%)</u>		<u>No Response (%)</u>	
Number of jobs	27	77.1	2	5.7	5	14.3	1	2.9
Number of businesses	26	74.3	2	5.7	6	17.1	1	2.9
Average rent for commercial space	21	60.0	2	5.7	10	28.6	2	5.7
Occupancy rates for buildings	25	71.4	2	5.7	5	14.3	3	8.6

Communities were asked to list the characteristics of their CBD revitalization program's staff which has been very important in the success of their program in dealing with outside entities. Table 40 is a list of their responses.

TABLE 40
Characteristics of the CBD revitalization program's staff and board members that are most important to the program's success in dealing with outside entities, such as city agencies, merchants, and community groups.

Positive Attitude
Enthusiastic
Dedicated
Professional
Knowledgeable
Good Communication

Table 41 is a list of characteristics of the CBD revitalization program's staff and board members that are most important to the program's internal management.

TABLE 41
Characteristics groups of the CBD Revitalization program's staff and board members that are most important to the program's internal management.

Organized
Professional
Communication
Leadership
Dedication

Communities were asked what skill would improve the management of their CBD program. Table 42 has a list of their responses.

TABLE 42
Skill areas which would improve management of a CBD revitalization Program.

Organizational Management
Time Management
Strategic Planning
Public Speaking
Grant Writing
Technical Expertise
Marketing
Architectural Expertise

When asked what would they change about their CBD program or what would they do different to improve their CBD program, communities responded with the list provided in Table 43.

TABLE 43
Areas which CBD revitalization program could be changed to improve success.

Increased Funding
Increased Staff
Increase Volunteer Base
Increase Organizaiton

Communities were asked what the single largest benefit of their CBD revitalization program has been. Their responses are in Table 44.

TABLE 44
Single largest area of benefit from CBD revitalization program.

New Businesses
Community Pride
Economic Activity Downtown
Attractive Downtown

Data Analysis

Data from the second survey were collected and summarized in table form. Data were also used to analyze which factors of a community and its program were the most influential in the program's success. This task was accomplished in three steps. The first step was for respondents to rate a program's success in the following 29 areas:

1. Physical Improvement of Buildings
2. Availability of Building Rehabilitation Finance
3. Physical Improvement of Public Buildings or Space
4. New Construction Activity
5. Building & Property Sales
6. Availability of Building Construction Finance
7. Parking or Traffic Improvements
8. Improvements to Sidewalks & Curbs
9. Downtown Cleanliness
10. New Business Recruitment
11. Business Retention
12. Property Developer Recruitment
13. Delivery of Municipal Services
14. Public Safety
15. Municipal Attitude
16. Improvement of the Image of Downtown
17. Improvement of Retail Shop Variety Downtown
18. Retention of Creation of Specialty Retail District Downtown
19. Special Community Events Downtown
20. Retail Events Downtown
21. Public Relations for Downtown Businesses
22. Job Creation
23. Tax Revenue Generation
24. Control Over Economic Growth
25. Civic Leadership
26. Public Attitude
27. Volunteer Involvement
28. Strategic Planning/Work plan
29. Organizational Development

Communities were given a six point scale to rate the above items. The scale

(1=very good, 2=good, 3=fair, 4=poor, 5= very poor, and 6=not applicable) was used to calculate a composite score for the community representing its program's success. When "not applicable" was selected it was not included in the score of the community.

Composite scores of communities ranged from 1.444 to 3.875. Each composite score would represent the community's dependant variable in the regression program, representing the degree of success for that community. Data from the second survey created 96 possible variables which could influence the success of a program. With the composite score calculated, the data from the second survey were entered into a SAS regression program with a stepwise procedure used to determine which of these factors were statistically significant at the 95% level. The stepwise regression procedure first fits a simple linear regression model for each of the $P - 1$ potential X variables. For each model the f statistic is obtained and the variable with the largest f value is added to the model. The procedure adds variables to the model until the value of the variable entering the model is less than the predetermined .05 level and if the value is less than that level then the procedure terminates.

There were six factors determined to be significant at the .05 level, they are:

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Coefficient</u>	<u>t statistic</u>
1. X25 New Construction Activity	.445097	2.652
2. X30 Downtown Cleanliness	2.485446	12.776
3. X36 Municipal Attitude	-0.385446	-2.232
4. X58 Business and or Developer Recruitment	-0.423317	-2.637
5. X59 Major New Development Project	-0.563305	-3.090
6. X67 Inadequate Private Funding for Program	.817796	5.038

The model has an R-square of .6577 when all of these variables are present.

New construction activity in this text is viewed as growth to the downtown area. New construction activity was an area of emphasis for many CBD revitalization programs. With a positive coefficient it first seems that this factor is counter productive for success (more successful communities have lower scores, dependant variables). However the value for the variable ranges from one to five. New construction activity is a sign that a downtown area is growing beyond the capacity existing facilities. It is important to note that new construction activity should be governed by a review board to ensure it remains within the flavor of the historic downtown area.

Downtown cleanliness is the next factor that was deemed significant. The visual appeal of downtown is important for many reasons. First a clean downtown conveys a sense of community pride in the downtown area. A clean downtown is representative of a successful/vibrant downtown. Shopping in a clean downtown is more appealing than shopping in an area lacking upkeep. The physical appeal of a downtown plays several roles in the success of a revitalization program. The cleanliness of downtown is also a physical change which can be seen by a community. Unlike changes in attitude, changes in appearance of the downtown can be seen and monitored. The high value of the variable (also ranging from one to five) indicates that most communities, more and less successful, focused on the cleanliness of their downtown.

Improvements in non-tangible areas are important to success. Changes in the attitudes of people in the community are often a goal of a revitalization program, but

they can be important keys to success. The next factor was municipal attitude. With a negative coefficient, a positive municipal attitude will improve the success of a community's revitalization effort. Positive attitude among municipal leaders can have an affect on a wide area of the revitalization efforts: recruitment, both business and developer; volunteer involvement; community attitude; and merchant involvement. These areas can all be affected by the attitude of municipal leaders.

Recruitment of new businesses and developers had a negative coefficient, which indicates it affects a community in a positive manner. Once existing businesses are stabilize new businesses can be recruited to fill the market niches demanded by the community. Filling these niches is important to reduce the amount of retail loss experienced by a community. Developer recruitment seeks individuals who are willing to invest in structures located in CBDs. These developers are essential for renovating existing, vacant buildings. Once renovated they rent or sell the buildings to entrepreneurs in the community. Construction to existing facilities constitutes new construction, but for some communities their whole revitalization effort revolves around one major project.

A major new development project as part of the revitalization effort adds to the success of a community. Many of the more successful communities had revitalization projects which were started because of an interest in restoring a historic structure or district. Such historic projects and new development projects act as a centerpiece for many Oklahoma revitalization efforts. This factor has a strong negative value indicating it is important to the success of a downtown project. A

major project can be used as a benchmark for the program as a whole. It can be used as a goal for the completion of the downtown effort as well.

One obstacle of the revitalization effort which was reported as important for communities was the lack of adequate private funding. Inadequate private funding was the only obstacle to appear in the list of significant factors. With a positive coefficient, a lack of private funding will have a negative impact on a revitalization program. Private funding represents one aspect of community support. Community support can come from volunteer work and from funding. When there is a lack of funding, capital improvements become difficult to make. Public funds are stretched to fill gaps in budgets when there is a shortage of private money. Volunteer work is important to show community support, however private funds are key to the daily operation of the revitalization program and to the financial obligations which a program incurs. These factors are not dissimilar to some factors which were deemed important in the 1988 National study.

The national study and this Oklahoma study did reach some similar conclusions as to what affects the success of a CBD revitalization program. The presence of obstacles were detrimental in both studies. A lack of private funding (Oklahoma study) and the lack of funding sources (national study) both proved to have a negative impact on revitalization efforts. The studies do emphasize some similar points: the downtown is an integral part of a community's economic health and that efforts to revitalize the CBD have a better chance of success when there is strong local support.

To better understand why some communities were successful in their revitalization efforts, case studies were conducted to increase the “feel” for what works in a CBD revitalization program. As it turned out, case studies proved to be an invaluable tool for program analysis. Case studies were conducted on eight Oklahoma communities, six Main Street communities and two Non-main Street communities. They were selected because of their unique characteristics that their program and community offered. These reports provided information about non-tangible factors which are important of the success of a community. Factors which were not easily measured by a survey. Each of the visits revealed a new factor which was important to the success of that community. These individual responses are listed below as a list of factors to complement the factors regressed above. They were not entered into the regression process and represent a different type of response, thus it is impossible to compare their significance to the statistical factors above. However, the contacts for the case studies were animate in their belief of the importance of these factors.

Case study factors:

- community support for the CBD revitalization program and process,
- a structured program emphasizing the documentation of the program’s goals and achievements,
- unilateral cooperation between civic and public organizations,
- volunteers and members dedicated to success for the good of the CBD,
- strong leadership in the CBD revitalization program’s board of directors.

Community support for the CBD revitalization program and process was stressed at many of the case study visits. Community support is responsible for volunteer work, private funding, and patience for the revitalization process. It is

important for the community to realize that a vital downtown is beneficial to all and not just resident merchants. Community residents need to support the process as well as the program. The process is much slower than the creation of the program itself. The revitalization process involves construction of buildings, changes in shopper's habits, and diversification of the local economy. All of these processes are slow and difficult to see.

A structured program keeps the momentum heading in a desirable direction. Keeping order to a revitalization effort and not permitting it to stray will improve the chances for a community's success. Keeping record of goals and accomplishments in a structured fashion keeps the program focused and moving. Without a structured program small incremental improvements will be lost without documentation. Laying out the goals in small attainable steps also give the program organizers an idea for the length of time the process will take to complete. A structured program will also improve the division of responsibilities among the community's organizations.

Unilateral cooperation between civic and public organizations is also very important. Organizations which work autonomously of the CBD program can be counterproductive. For example, if a civic organization, hoping to improve the community's situation, starts a campaign which negatively affect the chamber of commerce or other organization their efforts may cancel each other out. By uniting these organizations and dividing up the responsibilities for attaining a common goal, the CBD revitalization program can maximize the value of these organizations and their desire to improve their community. The work represented by these

organizations account for a great deal of the volunteer support from the community.

Volunteers and members of the revitalization program which are dedicated are critical for the success of the revitalization program. Volunteers play an important role in the organization of fund raising efforts and in the organization of festivals. Fund raising and festival organization are difficult parts of a revitalization program to operate without the aid of a dedicated volunteer group. Dedication to making improvements to buildings and involvement by all merchants are also important. The free rider can negatively affect a program or at least hinder the improvement process. In order for a downtown program to be effective all or most of the merchants need to be involved in the program.

SUMMARY

This report summarizes the results of two surveys conducted in Oklahoma. The first survey was mailed to 590 Oklahoma communities to determine which communities had active downtown revitalization programs. There were 160 responses (27 percent). Of the responding communities, 46 indicated that some sort of revitalization program had been in operation during the last 10 years. The population range of responding communities was similar to the statewide averages although survey responses in the 10,000 to 25,000 population range tended to have a higher representation.

Communities who responded to the first survey indicated that the time period 1986 to 1990 was difficult. Many of the respondents (41 percent) indicated the Central Business District (CBD) was declining during this time period. Reasons given for the decline were status of the local economy, status of the state/national economy, lack of a revitalization program, and competition from outlet and retail centers. The time period 1991 to 1995 was one of stabilization and improvement. The number of declining CBDs was reported to decrease. Stability or growth of CBDs was attributed to an improved local economy and, in many cases, presence of a revitalization program.

A detailed survey was mailed to 56 communities. This included the 46 responses to the initial survey plus 10 communities known to have a revitalization program. There were 37 (66 percent) who responded to this detailed survey. Twenty-five of the respondents were current main street communities. Respondents

indicated they had a revitalization program for anywhere from less than one year to ten years or more. Most respondents (40 percent) fell in the one to three year category regarding length of program existence. The average length of time for program existence was reported to be 4.2 years.

Several groups were reported to be involved in initiating local revitalization programs. Local merchants or property owners, banks, civic leaders, and community activists were the most frequently cited groups. Many reported they consulted with a government agency to assist with the development of the program (63 percent). The city was the most frequently cited local government entity and the Oklahoma Main Street Program with the Oklahoma Department of Commerce was cited most often as a state source of assistance. Most downtown revitalization programs (91 percent) were described as ongoing efforts with no specific target completion date (funds permitting).

Most respondents indicated the program is managed by a private organization (58 percent). Other categories reported include citizen groups and non-profit organizations which actually could be considered private as well. Programs tended to have a board of directors (89 percent) and the board was usually elected.

Only 5 communities (14.7 percent) rated economic conditions for their community as good or very good during the initial year of the program. This figure grew to 25 communities (75.8 percent) for 1995. There were 16 communities (45.7 percent) who rated the outlook for the community as very good for the next five years. Clearly, the last 10 years have shifted to a more positive focus for the

responding communities. About one-half (54 percent) of the respondents indicated the CBD was the primary retail center during the current year and 75 percent of the respondents indicated the CBD was the office center for the community. Most communities have a major discount store within the community (68 percent) and 27 percent have one within 30 miles. The effect of a major discount store within the community is reported to generally be detrimental to the CBD (64 percent) as opposed to beneficial (24 percent) or neutral (12 percent).

The size of the CBD revitalization program operating budgets ranged from less than \$10,000 to over \$100,000. Most fell into the \$10,000 - \$25,000 or \$25,000 - \$50,000 range (69 percent). The average budget size for programs during the initial year was reported to be \$35,530 and for 1995 the average budget size was \$39,499. Funding sources tended to be private (businesses within the CBD and outside the CBD) and public (local government). Private funding accounted for 61 percent of the total budgets in 1995.

Respondents were asked to indicate obstacles that have caused problems in implementing the CBD revitalization program. Inadequate funding from public and private sources was cited most frequently. Lack of active volunteers and low levels of political support were also cited. Visible failure of a specific project in the program was also cited an obstacle.

Only 37 percent of the respondents indicated a review board or historic commission exists to review alterations and construction downtown. Nine communities reported that historic district ordinances exist locally. Other local

ordinances which were noted include sign regulations. Most programs (71 percent) do provide non-financial design assistance to merchants and property owners.

A public relations campaign was frequently developed as a major part of the CBD revitalization program (74 percent). Primary audiences included residents, local businesses, tourists, and prospective businesses or developers. Coordinated retail sales events are also usually part of a CBD revitalization program (71 percent). The average number of events across responding communities was 3. Festivals were utilized by 80 percent of the respondents as part of the program. The average number of festivals annually per community was two. Attendance at these festivals ranged from less than 500 to over 20,000. Average attendance was reported to be 6,400.

Generally, the respondents indicated that positive changes had occurred since the initial year of the CBD revitalization program. Respondents indicated jobs in the CBD had increased (77 percent), number of businesses had increased (74 percent), average rent for commercial space had increased (60 percent), and occupancy rates had increased (71 percent). There are positive indications of change for the CBD's in question.

Respondents were asked to identify characteristics of CBD program staff and board members that are important for success. Many attributes were listed and characteristics which stand out include diversity, professionalism, commitment and dedication, credibility, vision, and a positive attitude. Staff and board members who are successful must also be tenacious since results sometimes take time to develop.

Characteristics important for internal management were also identified. There characteristics include being organized, creative, and being an effective communicator. A strong work ethic and a wide range of talents are also listed as important characteristics for successful internal management. Finally, receiving adequate training was mentioned as important.

Skills listed which would improve management of the CBD program tended to cluster in three areas: strategic planning, grants writing, and knowing how to gain support from the public. When asked what aspect of the CBD program might be changed or improved, the respondents indicated the obvious-increased funding. Also, increased citizen participation and raising the public's perception of the program were cited.

Respondents to the survey were asked to list the most important benefit of the CBD revitalization program to date. Responses varied but changes in attitude and a greater sense of pride were frequently mentioned. Improved image and vitality were also cited as significant benefits. The CBD program was often the catalyst for positive change in the communities.

Factor analysis revealed the characteristics of a CBD revitalization program which were significant at the 95% level. It is important to emphasize that these characteristics are not "stand alone" factors but tend to work together. It is also important to note that the case study analysis revealed areas of importance which were not indicated in the factor analysis. These areas and the five factors identified as most important for a successful CBD revitalization program are:

* Factor analysis factors-

- new construction activity
- downtown cleanliness
- municipal attitude
- business and or developer recruitment
- major new development project
- inadequate private funding for program

* Case study analysis factors-

- community support for the CBD revitalization program and process,
- a structured program emphasizing the documentation of the program's goals and achievements,
- unilateral cooperation between civic and public organizations,
- volunteers and members dedication to success for the good of the CBD,
- strong leadership in the CBD revitalization program's board of directors.

If a community is considering the implementation of a CBD revitalization program it would be well advised to take an inventory of resources both structural (buildings, sidewalks, infrastructure, etc.) and personnel wise, for it has been emphasized with on site visits that the people involved with the program will have much to do with the success of the program.

REFERENCES

- Chase, Robert A., and Glen C. Puller. 1983. "The Impact of Shopping Center Development on Downtowns of Small Nonmetropolitan Communities." *Journal of the Community Development Society*. Vol. 14 No. 2 : 55-66.
- Dworkin, Peter. 1987. "San Jose: Seeking Soul in the Sun Belt." *US News and World Reports*. August 10: 20-21.
- Eckenstahler, Charles. 1995. "Refilling Small Town Retail Space." *Economic Development Review*. Vol. 13, No. 2 : 92-93.
- Eckenstahler, Charles. 1995. "Retaining Downtown Business Via Business Succession." *Economic Development Review*. Spring : 94.
- Elrich, Fred, Gerald A. Doeksen and Mike D. Woods. 1995. "Economic Conditions and Trends in Rural Oklahoma." *Rural Development Council Research Report*.
- Flood, J. David and Dean F. Schreiner. "Availability of Retail and Business Services to Rural Populations." Research Application in Rural Development and Planning. *Research Report P-655*, Oklahoma State University. pp 164-177. 1972.
- Hamilton, et. al. Systems Simulation for Regional Analysis: An Application to River Basin Planning. *MIT Press*, Cambridge, Massachusetts. pp 1-53. 1964.
- Henderson, Lenneal J. 1993. "Baltimore: Managing the Civics of a 'Turnaround' Community." *National Civic Review*. Vol. 82, No. 4 : 329-339.
- Hoffer, William. 1989. "Main Street Revisited." *Nations Business*, January : 36-40.
- Johnson, Jerry and Carlos Moore. 1988. "Main Street, A Concept that spells Success for Small Town Businesses." *Baylor Business Review*. Winter 1988 : 22-27.
- Lackey, Susan and Charles Eckenstahler. 1995. "The Forgotten Role of Retail in Economic Development." *Economic Development Review*. Vol. 13, No. 2 : 85-87.
- Lawhead, Terry. 1995. "A Comprehensive Strategy for Rural Downtowns." *Economic Development Review*. Spring : 75-81.

- Leinenkugel, Jake. 1995. "Urban Revitalization: It's Not Just for Large Cities." *Executive Speeches*. Vol. 9, No. 4 : 16.
- Morris, Philip. 1994. "Remaking Main Street." *Southern Living*. Vol. 29, No. 8 : 64-67.
- Pittman, Robert H. and Rhonda P. Culp. 1995. "When Does Retail Count as Economic Development?" *Economic Development Review*. Vol. 13, No. 2 : 4-6.
- Richardson, Harry W. Regional Economics: Location Theory, Urban Structure, Regional Change. Praeger Publications, New York. pp 321-357. 1969.
- Richardson, Harry W. "The State of Regional Economics: A Survey Article." *International Regional Science Review*. Vol. 3, No. 1 : pp 1-48. 1978.
- Riegel, Stephanie. 1995. "The Big Picture: Downtown Faces the Future." *New Orleans Magazine*. Vol. 29, No. 9 : 63-68.
- Ukens, Carol. 1991. "Wal-Mart not the Enemy after all, Small Town finds." *Drug Topics*. Vol. 135, No.17 : 12, 16.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census, Population Estimates Branch, Oklahoma State Center. *Oklahoma Department of Commerce*. 1995.
- Wagner, Matthew. 1995. "Downtown Business Development: The example of Sheboygan Falls, Wisconsin." *Economic Development Review*. Vol. 13, No. 2 : 82-84.
- Wagoner, Richard, and Ted Miller. "Revitalizing Downtown: 1976-1986." The National Trust for Historic Preservation in Association with The Urban Institute. 1988.
- Walter, J. Jackson. 1986. "Historic Rehabilitation Tax Incentives: Stimulating Economic Development While Preserving America's Heritage." *Government Finance Review*. February: 5-12.

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brooks, Rusty and Cindy Searcy. 1995. "Downtowns in Georgia: Where Are We and What Do We Know." *Small Town*. Vol. 26, No. 3 : 14-28.

This article was written to report findings from a survey conducted of Georgia's towns with a population of 500 and greater. The article begins with a quick review of the demise of Georgia's downtown areas since WWII. Many blame the fall of the cotton economy and the out-migration that was witnessed after WWII. Add in the competition for new discount outlet and shopping malls, as well as changes in consumer lifestyles, geographic mobility, and shoppers expectations which all lead to the continual decline of the community's CBD. The loss of existing businesses and competition from new discount retailers began a cycle of disinvestment which eventually leads to the decline of a community's downtown.

The survey's data was divided into six sections: characteristics of respondents, general attitudes about physical characteristics of downtown, additional aspects of downtown, attitudes towards businesses downtown, attitudes toward services downtown, and opportunities for downtown.

Survey respondents for the most part lived within the city limits of their community. Two thirds held elected offices while the majority of the remainder were city employees. There were 238 respondents who indicated that they either owned (12 percent), were employed (5 percent) by downtown businesses, or maintained a professional office downtown (3 percent). While fewer than 1 in 3 (32 percent) considered themselves frequent downtown shoppers.

When responding to questions about the attitudes towards the physical

characteristics of the downtown, respondents generally agreed that their downtowns have a generally clean appearance, good traffic circulation, well-maintained streets, and adequate street lighting. The areas they felt needed the greatest attention were: public transportation, historic preservation, and the use of upper stories of buildings to their fullest potential.

In the area of additional aspects of downtown most respondents viewed that their downtown was in good shape though their building vacancy rate was between 10 and 25 percent. When asked who or what office to contact if a person was interested in a building or a business downtown to rent or purchase, most respondents indicated that they would contact someone in the local government-related offices such as the city hall or the mayor (33 percent) more than any other option. The chamber of commerce (12 percent), the downtown development authority (8 percent) and local real estate offices (8 percent) were distant second choices. Of respondent cities, 41 percent indicated that their downtown had a merchants association, 47 percent reported having a downtown development authority, and 18 percent indicated they had a Main Street program in operation.

When asked about attitudes towards downtown businesses, the highest rated response was that the downtown had good support from the local government. The second highest response was that the downtown merchants kept convenient store hours followed by the downtown being known for quality customer service. The two lowest ratings were given by these two statements respectively; the downtown merchants association does a good job of promoting the downtown and informing the

community of what downtown has to offer, followed by their downtown offering a wide variety of stores.

Attitudes towards public services gave the highest ratings for the following four service areas: fire protection, water system, trash and garbage service, and police protection. The two services which received the lowest ratings were water fountains and public restrooms.

The section dealing with opportunities for downtown listed need for increased store variety followed by the general clean up of downtown, more cultural and entertaining events, more parking, more apartments or housing for rent, and an increased number of promotions and sales. The two least endorsed changes or ideas were increased government services and free parking. The largest reason given for not shopping downtown was not being able to find what was needed followed by higher prices and no available professional services.

In review the authors gave characteristics which lead to the most successful downtowns. These characteristics included the existence of a downtown merchants association, the community being a county seat and having a downtown development agency.

Dworkin, Peter. 1987. "San Jose: Seeking Soul in the Sun Belt." US News and World Reports. August 10: 20-21.

This article reviews the efforts to vitalize San Jose's downtown area. San Jose is unique in that its downtown has never experienced prosperity relative to commercial parks located on the outskirts of town. Most of the businesses which

locate in San Jose are High Tech firms wanting to be close to Silicone Valley. These High Tech firms are attracted to the campus-like layout of commercial parks. This presents a problem for the downtown area in attracting these firms. Downtown areas inherently segregate firms by limiting their ability to spread out their operation.

To improve the social situation, San Jose is constructing several social attractions such as a children's museum, a High Tech museum, and a new theater. Citizens are also attempting to make San Jose a "24 hour" city by opening socially attractive businesses such as theme cafe's, bookshops, espresso shops, and sushi bars. The San Jose vitalization effort is currently under way at the time the article was written and there was not much in progress to report.

Eckenstahler, Charles. 1995. "Refilling Small Town Retail Space." *Economic Development Review*. Vol. 13, No. 2 : 92-93.

This article was written to report the results of a survey mailed to 86 Michigan non-metropolitan communities. The fifteen question survey asked the communities if they had a formal business recruitment program for their downtown. Most of the respondents did not have a full or part time staff to conduct such a program. The survey revealed that most Michigan towns try to attract businesses with a direct mailing approach sending them information about their CBD. The communities believed that this was the most successful way to attract firms. Slightly under half of the communities surveyed believed that their program for attracting new businesses was successful. About half said that they witnessed new firms opening in their CBD after six months of their program. More than half of the new firms were started by

local people. Most communities do not have funds set aside for mailing to potential new firms located outside of their community. Communities which advertised relied on real estate magazines and local newspapers.

The author closed the article with a list of suggestions for communities which operate a mailing recruitment program. The list includes adequate staff, targeting potential out of town people, a customer advertising program, festivals and promotional activities, and focusing on the importance of shopper loyalty.

Eckenstahler, Charles. 1995. "Retaining Downtown Business Via Business Succession." *Economic Development Review*. Spring : 94.

This article addressed one specific issue involving the retention of business downtown by succession. There is a cycle present in downtowns which begins with the retirement of a store owner. The owner retires and has a going out of business sale, liquidates his/her assets, closes shop and retires. Now the community begins to recruit new businesses to fill the vacant area left by the retiree. A way to break this cycle is through business succession. One way to promote succession could be the establishment of a program which would provide assistance for the sale of an existing business to a current employee or other person which would continue the business.

The author then reviews an example of how business succession worked in Allegan, Michigan. This example shows how a store owner was reaching retirement and was considering closing the store when he retired. Besides being very active in the total operation of the shoe store, the succession steps involved hiring a full time manager during the last year of his working/owning the store. The manager

provided a transitional period which allowed for the new owner to ease into the operation of the store as well as letting the outgoing owner the adjustment of turning over the store when the time came. In summary the author notes that business succession does not receive a lot of notoriety in development planning.

Feiock, Richard, Melvin Dubnick, and Jerry Mitchell. 1993. "State Economic Development Policies and National Economic Growth." *Public Administration Quarterly*. Vol. 17, No. 1 : 55-67.

This journal article reviewed the role of state and local development strategies and how they affect the national economy. The authors argue that state and local economic policy making has been central to the strength of the national economy of the U.S. over the past decade. They point out that during the 1980s, state governments filled the vacuum left by a national government policy that intentionally avoided an explicit industrial policy. By stimulating economic activity within their respective jurisdictions, states and their subregions provided the stimulus that carried the U.S. through a major national economic downturn and years of sustained growth. Their argument is based on two premises: 1) states possess the capability to influence positively the operations of the national economy, 2) that state and local economic development activities have an overall positive impact on the American Economy.

These premises often draw criticisms. First, while state and local economic development activities might sustain or accelerate existing positive market trends, they are inevitably ineffective in initiating national economic growth. Second, it is a popular view that state and local economic development activities increase the

inefficiency of the U.S. economy by engaging in “zero sum” competition for jobs and capital investment.

It is argued that states have the ability to alter the degree of business competition in the American economy by changing market variables. This is most common in public/private ventures and state level economic regulation, particularly among banks, utilities, common carriers, and the licensed “ trades” and professions. States take advantage of their ability to adjust risks and liabilities faced by private sector companies. State government’s most important leverage point has been the provision of financial and other resources that directly encourage private investment.

Evidence to support the authors’ claims were presented with the change in research over the last twenty years. Initially data indicated that state and local economic policy was not important in the location decision of firms. However, this data was derived from surveying 100 of the nation’s largest companies, these firms represent only one percent of the businesses operating in the country. New research indicates that after production costs are considered, state and local tax rates as well as other locally controlled variables are considered in the location of a new or expanding firm.

When dealing with the issue of the national economy as a zero-sum game, the authors note this assumption/view does not account for the creation of new businesses. State and local incentives that foster entrepreneurship and help bring firms that would not have existed into business are positive sum. By lowering the cost or risk of doing business, states foster the creation of new businesses as well as

give them a better chance to survive.

In conclusion the authors present their final arguments as to the importance of local and state development activities to the national economy. This article did not deal directly with downtown revitalization efforts, but it did cover some theory about local, regional, and national development.

Henderson, Lenneal J. 1993. "Baltimore: Managing the Civics of a 'Turnaround' Community." National Civic Review. Vol. 82, No. 4 : 329-339.

This article reviews the importance of balance between civic and business revitalization in community redevelopment. Baltimore is examined as the typical large American city which has faced economic decline and an increase in social discontent. Statistics are provided to show how changes in Baltimore's economy have lead to higher crime, poverty, and a general out migration of wealth from the City. Many of the problems facing Baltimore are shared with many other major American cities. The urban areas outside of Baltimore are growing and do not share many of the problems that the inner city faces. The continual decline of traditional industries in the central business district have prompted officials to take action to try and revitalize Baltimore.

Business revitalization efforts have met with some success. The harbor, which was once the largest employer and a traditional industry, has found new life as a major tourist attraction. A new ballpark was built for the Orioles in Camden Yards. There are new hotels and office buildings being built in the central business district. These business efforts were also accompanied by many social/civic revitalization

efforts. New personnel were brought in to address social issues such as teen pregnancy, high-school dropouts, and crime. Task forces were created and worked in tandem with civic organizations to come up with a plan to improve the social conditions of city life. To date there are many new public works projects funded by local government as well as community groups, designed to improve the aesthetics of the inner city area.

Basically this article is a quick review of the programs which represent the social side of urban development. The article makes good points in a six part contract which was followed in the Baltimore revitalization case.

Hoffer, William. 1989. "Main Street Revisited." Nations Business, January : 36-40.

This article was a review of one community and its efforts to revitalize its downtown area. The community employed assistance for its revitalization efforts from the American Institute of Architects (AIA). The AIA sponsors a program called Regional/Urban Design Assistance Teams (R/UDAT) which has been in operation since 1967. The R/UDAT program unites communities in need of assistance with professionals who can help in their efforts. R/UDAT professionals donate their time and skills to aid the community in developing a plan to revitalize their Main Street. The community pays for travel and other related expenses of the volunteers. Since the inception of the R/UDAT program more than 500 men and women from more than 30 professional disciplines have donated an estimated \$3.5 million worth of services to areas in 40 states with a combined population of 21 million.

The article reviews R/UDAT's efforts and success in Healdsburg California. This small community of 880 is located in the center of California's premium wine region. The article then goes on to review the progress made in Healdsburg and what was done to make these changes.

Johnson, Jerry and Carlos Moore. 1988. "Main Street, A Concept that spells Success for Small Town Businesses." Baylor Business Review. Winter 1988 : 22-27.

This article written by two Baylor professors, briefly reviews the history of the Main Street Program as well as the economic conditions which lead to the program's development. The article attributes the decline of the small town retail environment to four factors: 1) the urbanization of America which places large urban shopping markets close to small communities, 2) electronic media promotion of large urban stores which offer an abundance of merchandise choices to smaller market shoppers, 3) increased mobility of consumers, and 4) more informed and knowledgeable consumers who have defined product concepts who will not be limited to products available in local markets. Most of a communities Main Street consists of retail businesses. With the decline of the retail environment so to has the condition of many downtowns declined. Recently public and private leaders have recognized that the vitality of a central business district is very important to the success of an area's overall economic development plan.

In recognition of the importance of restoration of economic vitality to central business districts, the National Trust for Historic Preservation created the National

Main Street Center in 1980. The Main Street approach to revitalization of business districts builds on a total image improvement of a downtown area. This approach is covered in four areas: 1) organization, arranges for separate groups to work together in a core business district, 2) promotion, advertising and promoting the core business district as a growing place, 3) design, enhancing the physical appearance of downtown, and 4) economic restructuring, focuses on the diversification and revitalization of the central business district. This Main Street approach can help a community in four ways: 1) it can create or restore a positive image of the downtown area, 2) attract potential investors through lower property values in the downtown area, 3) increase the potential for more diverse types of businesses to locate in a downtown area, and 4) provide business leaders an opportunity to unite and promote the restoration of the central business district. The article then covers the history of the Main Street Program in Texas as well as the program's role in the revitalization of a central business district.

Krohe, James Jr. 1992. "Is Downtown Worth Saving?" *Planning*. Vol. 58, No. 8 : 9-13.

This article reviews downtown revitalization and how most revitalization programs focus on the physical improvement of the downtown area. The author argues that not enough consideration is given to the social side of revitalization efforts. Physical improvements of buildings and historic structures are what people think of when they are considering revitalizing downtown. Many cities have learned that new facades on buildings in a downtown with poor economic conditions will

prove futile. Promotions often give only the illusion of economic health, they attract a crowd of people who, for the most part, do not shop much in the downtown area, nor will they start to. Current revitalization plans involve the buzz word diversification. The National Main Street program emphasizes diversification as a key to successful downtown revitalization.

It is argued that downtown is as much a process as it is a place. Downtown should be the place where a community comes together to do business. In smaller towns this usually meant the traditional downtown area. Downtown areas need to function as a center for social activity as well as for economic activity. Today's citizen does not associate downtown in this way. New downtown revitalization efforts must improve downtown's image similar to the safe and sanitized image of the mall. Suburban sensibility must be catered to by employers, developers, and retailers. Trends in retail management of downtown businesses treat the downtown firms collectively, setting similar hours, providing security, and assuring litter control. These types of actions are usually easier to enact in a smaller sized community where the downtown area can be regulated easier. Treating the downtown area as the center for economic activity is still valid, but most developers stop there. It is important to note the importance of the downtown area as a center for social activity as well.

Lackey, Susan and Charles Eckenstahler. 1995. "The Forgotten Role of Retail in Economic Development." *Economic Development Review*. Vol. 13, No. 2 : 85-87.

The article opens with a review of the traditional role of retail income in

development economics. An argument is made that the role of retail is taken for granted and is not properly addressed when economic development theory is used in economic planning. The article then moves on to an example of retail leakage for a business center which serves a community in Michigan. County business developers estimated the leakage at \$90,000,000 based on 1992 census data. The authors conducted a study and found that the retail leakage was closer to \$300,000,000. They point to the fact that retail is not paid its due attention for its important role for development. Then the article moves on to the use of the findings of their study. Areas of emphasis include increasing retail concentration to convenience the shopper, cooperative advertising, establishing a customer service program, and implementing a local program.

Lawhead, Terry. 1995. "A Comprehensive Strategy for Rural Downtowns." Economic Development Review. Spring : 75-81.

This article was written by a senior program associate of the Arizona Main Street Program. It reviewed the problems facing rural downtowns and how they are unique due to numerous social and economic factors. The largest problem is the significant leakage of retail sales to new shopping centers or retail power centers offering lower prices and located either outside of the downtown or in a neighboring city a few hours away. Another problem is the management/ownership structure. A traditional CBD is an economic entity which houses several firms which compete for the office, housing, and entertainment markets as well as the retail markets of a specific community. On the other hand, a retail power center houses large chain

stores which provide competitively priced products at a volume not achievable by smaller operations. Retailers in these power centers do not work autonomously, they report to the overall management where decision making is coordinated and controlled.

The challenge in revitalizing a rural downtown is dealing with the many individuals which own the respective businesses in the CBD. These individuals always have different personalities and ideas as to what needs to be done to revitalize downtown, and what their role should be. The chief task is to coordinate these efforts and ideas into accomplishing one goal, the revitalization of downtown as a whole. One program designed to coordinate these efforts is the National Main Street Program. The National Main Street Program was started by the National Trust for Historic Preservation in 1977. The Main Street program was designed to: study the reasons downtowns were dying; identify the many factors that have an impact on downtown health; and develop a comprehensive strategy that would encourage economic development within the context of historic preservation.

Essential factors for the Main Street approach included the following: 1) a strong public private partnership; 2) a committed organization; a full time project manager; 3) a commitment to good design; 4) quality promotional programs; and 5) a coordinated, incremental approach to economic development which produced achievable concrete goals. These are important in the four point Main Street approach; design, organization, promotion, and economic restructuring. Local leadership is important. Ideally, a local manager is fully qualified in understanding

the process of economic development and can act as a liaison between numerous individuals and public and private groups. The leader must also be willing to take directions from a board of residents, business owners, and elected officials.

Some common problems faced by downtowns are: sales leakage to surrounding shopping malls; parking downtown is problematic at best; lack of direction in downtown planning; marketing of existing businesses is non-existent; and business are usually undercapitalized. In order to address these problems a successful strategy must possess the following essentials: 1) It relies on quality, be it a building or a person, a town must focus on its best existing assets; 2) it acknowledges, causes, and incorporates changes in attitudes; and 3) it implements change one step at a time. It is important to find and strengthen anchor businesses. Strengthening existing businesses send out signals that customer loyalty, continuity of important goods and services are important to the community. The support for existing firms also indicates to prospective new firms that the community is serious about strengthening its downtown area. The first step in creating a downtown revitalization program is the market study. The study should provide: a historical understanding of the area; a complete inventory of the existing space and business in the target area; data concerning the characteristics of the local consumer population; inventory of services provided by competitive retail centers; and a listing of all non-retail related functions such as transportation routes, office or housing located in the district, public improvements, and parking. From this study a comprehensive strategy can be designed to fit the needs for the specific community. The strategy would address

merchandising, district layout, customer service and management.

Leinenkugel, Jake. 1995. "Urban Revitalization: It's Not Just for Large Cities." Executive Speeches Vol. 9, No. 4 : 16.

This was a speech given at the Governor's Conference on Downtown Revitalization in Sheboygan Falls, Wisconsin. In the beginning the orator reviewed the importance of central business districts to communities. Downtowns are important because in almost every community the central business district represents a prominent employment center. Therefore, many jobs rely on the viability of the downtown area. Often downtown represents the largest concentration of businesses in a community, and the health of the downtown affects the health of the surrounding businesses as well. Downtown is a reflection of how a community views itself. If the downtown is neglected, prospective investors or citizens will view this neglect as a reflection of the entire community and its citizens. This projected image will affect their decisions regarding locating or investing in the community. The vitality of the central business district is also important because of its tax base. If the CBD declines, its property will decrease in value, and this tax burden will have to be shifted to other parts of the community. Downtown represents the historic core of the community. The community's heritage and ideals are represented by the historic buildings, types of businesses, and structures present in downtown. Downtown is also important because it provides a sense of community.

Downtowns were the dominant centers for businesses until the end of WWII, at which time America moved out into the suburbs. During the 1960s and 1970s,

downtowns neglected their heritage as historic renovation of buildings gave way to attempts to modernize the appearance of these structures. This was a direct attempt to challenge the new retail and business centers, malls. By the late 1970s many developers realized that what they viewed as progress was indeed hurting the vitality of their downtown district. Their plans had lead to congested streets and highways, uncontrolled growth, inconsistent architecture, empty store fronts, boarded up buildings, trash strewn streets, and a reduced number of shoppers. Present revitalization efforts attempt to restore community identities. The National Main Street Program thrusts for a redefinition of character within a community. There are more than 850 Main Street towns and cities across the country. Nationally, every dollar invested in the operation of a local Main Street program has leveraged more than \$22 of public and private investment in physical improvements.

Morris, Philip. 1994. "Remaking Main Street." *Southern Living*. Vol. 29, No. 8 : 64-67.

This article was primarily a pictorial, focusing on the renovations made to historic buildings in Greenville, South Carolina. This community sought assistance from the Main Street program in South Carolina. The Community wanted to make the downtown area a place for citizens to come after 5:30 p.m. Leaders of the revitalization effort focused on improving the physical appearance of the downtown area. Improvements made inside individual retail centers were encouraged by program officials. Many landscape improvements accompanied the renovation to the buildings of the CBD. This article was not especially informative, but did give a

good visual account of their efforts to revitalize their downtown area.

Riegel, Stephanie. 1995. "The Big Picture: Downtown Faces the Future." New Orleans Magazine. Vol. 29, No. 9 : 63-68.

This article reviews past and current economic revitalization efforts in New Orleans. Current changes in the local economy have the New Orleans economy shifting from the traditional commerce firms to new service-based structure based on tourism and hospitality industries. New Orleans has some \$2 billion worth of new construction from these new service industries. Many of the new expansions are public works projects. Projects such as the expansion of their convention center, restoration of the Canal Street street-cars, expansion of the Aquarium, and a new sports arena. Private developers are spending more money on their own projects, construction of the world's largest land based casino, three new river boat casinos, and expansion of the downtown medical corridor. These projects do not include the stretch of new hotels under development for construction before the next decade. New Orleans is undergoing a major transformation of its economic base. Some criticize that the new thrust of casinos will increase the crime rate. Steps are being taken to ensure that crime will be dealt with so that tourist will feel safe during their visit. These steps include hiring numerous 'guides' which will wear uniforms as an added measure of security. Developers are gambling that the new growth in the gambling industry will spill over into other industries as well. City officials are optimistic that they will be able to attract high technology firms as well as biomedical firms, if they can do this is yet to be seen.

Ukens, Carol. 1991. "Wal-Mart not the Enemy after all, Small Town finds." Drug Topics. Vol. 135, No.17 :12, 16.

This article was in a journal which discusses issues facing the Pharmaceutical industry. There was a review of the affect Wal-Mart had on a small town Pharmacist. Resident retailers of Viroqua decided to mobilize their resources and revitalize their downtown in an effort to survive. The retailers did not plan to take on Wal-Mart, but to focus on the areas of service which the retail giant could not offer to local residents. In the case of the pharmacist, he noticed a decline in his prescriptions by 25 percent six months after the opening of Wal-Mart's pharmacy. The pharmacist's strategy was to compete with Wal-Mart on services and not price. The local Pharmacy offered free delivery, longer hours, and mail delivery for rural customers. Other retail shops in downtown began to offer similar services. Along with the change in business, the downtown area was given a facelift, the town became a Main Street town and initiated many rehabilitation and image improvement projects. The community raised upwards of \$300,000 to improve the appearance of downtown.

It is important to note that Wal-Mart was active in the downtown revitalization efforts. Wal-Mart tries to avoid advertising lower prices on specific goods compared to downtown merchants. Wal-Mart participates in local sales and promotional activities as well and donates to the local Industrial Development Board. The local Merchants also benefit from the shopping spill over from Wal-Mart.

Wagner, Matthew. 1995. "Downtown Business Development: The example of Sheboygan Falls, Wisconsin." *Economic Development Review*. Vol. 13, No. 2 : 82-84.

This article reviews the downtown revitalization efforts in Sheboygan Falls, Wisconsin. This article reviews another town which became a Main Street town and turned its economic fortunes around. The author reviews the four point Main Street approach and discusses some of the specifics used in the restoration of the CBD. First the community took an inventory of existing resources. This market analysis was used to define demographic characteristics of their community, from which they determined the areas of greatest need. Their program was tailored to those needs. The importance for aggressive people in leadership roles was emphasized in the article.

The article closed with a list of recommendations for communities considering the establishment of a revitalization program. Focus on long term goals and recognition that revitalization programs are not a quick fix was also addressed in the conclusion.

Walter, J. Jackson. 1986. "Historic Rehabilitation Tax Incentives: Stimulating Economic Development While Preserving America's Heritage." *Government Finance Review*. February: 5-12.

This article reviewed the effect historic tax incentives had on the rehabilitation of historic buildings and structures into modern facilities. The article was written at a time when the Reagan Administration was busy reforming the tax code. One of the items being reviewed for possible elimination were the historic rehabilitation tax

credits. Rehabilitation Tax Credits were part of the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981. These tax credits were responsible for \$6 billion in rehabilitation expenditures in 6800 buildings during three fiscal years, 1982-1984.

The article gave a quick review of the history of the preservation movement which started in the 1850s with the foundation of an organization called the Mount Vernon Ladies association of the Union. Ann Pamela Cunningham formed the organization to fight a proposed conversion of George Washington's house into a manufacturing facility. This successful endeavor spread from historic building to historic building for nearly a century. In the 1920s and 1930s the restoration of Colonial Williamsburg Virginia represented an expansion of the preservationist movement. The National Trust was created by congress in 1949 as a private non-profit membership organization dedicated to the preservation and continual use of America's architectural, cultural, and maritime heritage. In 1966, the National Historical Preservation Act created the Federal Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. The council required that federal agencies take into account historic resources when planning highways, dams, housing, and other public works projects. There were modest tax credits created in the 1976 tax reform legislation. Most of the historic preservation boom occurred after the passage of the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981.

Rehabilitation tax credits are broken down into three tiered investment categories: 25 percent for substantial rehabilitation of "certified historic structures," which may be combined with a 19 year cost recovery period for the adjusted basis of

the buildings; 20 percent for non-historic buildings at least 40 years old; and 15 percent for non-historic buildings at least 30 years old. The 15 and 20 percent credits can be used for commercial and industrial buildings only, and are not available to "certified historic structures."

Data collected to evaluate the effectiveness of the historic tax credits show a trend of increased investment in historic structures with the tax credits in place. In 1981, before the 25 percent tax credit was in place, rehabilitation expenditures totaled \$650 million. In the fiscal year 1982 this total grew to over \$1.5 billion. By the end of 1984 the rehabilitation expenditures reached \$5.96 billion. Of this total, 61 percent was used for housing projects.

The National push for historic rehabilitation has lead to the creation of many state programs/incentives as well. States are better suited to offer tax credits because they collect tax revenue from sales, property, and income tax. The federal government is limited to various types of income tax. Most state constitutions are set up to allow local governments some flexibility to establish historic tax credits at the local level.

APPENDIX I

SAMPLE COVER LETTERS AND SURVEYS



Oklahoma Cooperative Extension Service
Division of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources
Oklahoma State University

Department of Agricultural Economics • 513 Agricultural Hall
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74078-6026 • (405) 744-6081 • Fax (405) 744-8210

October 23, 1995

Dear City Leader and/or Official:

Downtown revitalization is an important facet of a community's economic development efforts. We are working with the Oklahoma Department of Commerce and the Oklahoma Main Street Program to catalog and analyze downtown revitalization efforts. The Main Street program has been assisting Oklahoma towns for ten years. It is important to analyze these types of revitalization efforts so we can continue to improve. Your assistance is critical.

Please complete the enclosed survey and return it by November 10, 1995 in the postage paid envelope. If your community has an active downtown revitalization program, there will be a follow-up survey later. The first 25 completed surveys received will entitle those towns to a complimentary copy of Oklahoma Design Guidelines, a 105 page publication that provides design recommendations to building owners. All individual responses will be held confidential. We will summarize your responses and provide a copy of the results to those who return the questionnaire.

If you have any questions, please feel free to write or telephone us. Thank you for your help. Your information will go toward the making of a stronger Oklahoma.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Mike Woods
Professor
405 744-9837

Robert Rushing
Graduate Student
405 744-9985

Downtown Revitalization in Oklahoma

City: _____

Name of
Respondent: _____

Address: _____

Telephone: _____

1. What was the estimated population of your community in 1995? _____

2. In this questionnaire, the Central Business District (CBD) is defined as the area that historically served as the primary shopping and office center of your community.

Was the CBD the primary shopping and office center of your community in the following years? (Circle your response for each year).

1986 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Do Not Know

1990 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Do Not Know

1995 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Do Not Know

3. Please estimate the following: 1986 1990 1995

Size of your CBD in number of blocks? _____ _____ _____

In square miles? _____ _____ _____

In number of business (all types)? _____ _____ _____

Annual retail sales? _____ _____ _____

Number of jobs? _____ _____ _____

4. Between 1986 and the end of 1990, was your CBD: (Circle the number that corresponds to your answer)

1 = Growing/Improving 2 = Stable 3 = Declining 4 = Do Not Know

PLEASE COMPLETE QUESTIONS 5 TO 8 ON NEXT PAGE

5. Why was your CBD either growing/improving; stable, or declining? (check all that apply)

_____ Status of your local economy
_____ Status of the state or national economy
_____ Property of ownership issues
_____ Presence or lack of a revitalization program
_____ Competition from outlet mall or discount retailer
_____ Other (list) _____
_____ Other (list) _____

6. Between 1991 and 1995, was your CBD: (Circle the number that corresponds to your answer)

1 = Growing/Improving 2 = Stable 3 = Declining 4 = Do Not Know

7. Why was your CBD either growing/improving; stable, or declining? (check all that apply)

_____ Status of your local economy
_____ Status of the state or national economy
_____ Property of ownership issues
_____ Presence or lack of a revitalization program
_____ Competition from outlet mall or discount retailer
_____ Other (list) _____
_____ Other (list) _____

8. At any time between 1986 and 1995, has a revitalization program operated in your CBD?

1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Do Not Know

If yes, who is (or was) the contact person for the revitalization program?

NAME: _____

ADDRESS: _____

TELEPHONE: _____

**THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.
PLEASE MAIL IT BACK IN THE ENVELOPE PROVIDED.**



Oklahoma Cooperative Extension Service
Division of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources
Oklahoma State University

Department of Agricultural Economics • 513 Agricultural Hall
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74078-6026 • (405) 744-6081 • Fax (405) 744-8210

January 15, 1996

Dear City Leader and/or Official:

Last fall we mailed screener surveys to about 1,500 city leaders representing over 500 cities across the state. We are working with the Oklahoma Department of Commerce to identify ongoing downtown revitalization efforts. We identified approximately 40 such programs. Included in the screener survey response was your name and address as the contact person for the revitalization program.

We are now following-up with a second survey instrument to learn more about successful downtown revitalization efforts. This survey is designed to gather a range of information regarding revitalization efforts. Some of the questions may not pertain to your community program. Please fill out as many questions as you can.

Please note that this survey is double sided. *Please take the time to respond to the enclosed questionnaire and return in the postage paid envelope by February 2, 1996.*

We appreciate your thoughtful contribution. We will provide a summary report to all of those who respond. This is an important effort if we are to continue to encourage downtown revitalization efforts in Oklahoma. If you have any questions please feel free to write or telephone us. Thanks again for your help.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Mike Woods
Professor
405 744-9837

Robert Rushing
Graduate Student
405 744-9985

Downtown Revitalization Survey

COMMUNITY: _____

RESPONDENT: _____

ADDRESS: _____

TELEPHONE NUMBER: _____

In this survey, the Central Business District (CBD) is defined as the area that historically served as the primary shopping and office center of your community.

What year was your CBD revitalization program started? _____

Throughout the survey, questions will refer to the initial year. This is the year that your program was initiated and should be the same as the year listed above. If you need additional space use the backside and reference the question.

1. Which of the following groups were involved in initiating the revitalization program?

Circle the numbers corresponding to all answers that apply.

1-Local merchants or property owners in the central business district

2-Bankers

3-Corporate and civic leaders other than central business district property owners

4-Mayor or other elected or appointed officials

5-City manager or other public staff

6-Technical assistance providers (e.g. consultants)

7-Community organizers and activists

8-Other: _____

2. Did you consult with a government agency to assist with the development of the CBD program?

1-Yes

2-No

If yes, please list the agency or agencies, and how they were used.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

5. _____

3. Does the CBD revitalization program have a target completion date or is the program intended to be continuously ongoing so long as there is support or funding?

1-Specified completion targeted

Date _____

2-Ongoing effort (funds permitting)

4. In the initial year what group managed the CBD revitalization program?

Name of group: _____

Which category describes the group? (circle appropriate number):

1-public official(s)/ or agency

2-private organization(s)

3-citizen groups

4-other: _____

5. Currently what group manages the CBD revitalization program?

Name of group: _____

Which category describes the group? (circle appropriate number):

1-public official(s)/or agency

2-private organization(s)

3-citizen group

4-other: _____

Does the program have a board of directors?

1- Yes

2-No

If yes, how many members serve on the board _____.

Are they elected or appointed?

1-elected

2-appointed

3-some elected and some appointed

6. If the program is managed by a private organization, is it a:

1-for profit organization

2-non-profit organization (select the non-profit category)

501(c)(3)

501(c)(6)

501(c)(1)

501(c)(4)

7. Rate the economic conditions for your community in the initial year and in 1995. Circle the number in the appropriate column for each year's rating.

	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor
Initial year	1	2	3	4	5
1995	1	2	3	4	5

8. Rate the future outlook for your central business district over the next five years. Circle your response.

1-Very Good

2-Good

3-Fair

4-Poor

5-Very Poor

9. Indicate whether the CBD was the primary retail or office center of your community in the following years, by circling yes or no:

	<u>Initial year</u>		<u>Current year</u>	
Retail Center	yes	no	yes	no
Office Center	yes	no	yes	no

10. If the CBD was not the primary retail center of your city in 1995, indicate why. Circle all that apply.

- 1-Competition from other retail centers within the community
- 2-Competition from other retail centers outside of the community
- 3-Changes in consumer shopping habits
- 4-Loss of anchor stores or change in retail mix
- 5-Inadequate parking
- 6-Unfavorable image of downtown
- 7-Other: _____

11. Is there a major discount store (e.g. Wal-Mart) or Outlet Mall located in or near your community?

<u>Within the community</u>	<u>Within 30 miles</u>	<u>Within 60 miles</u>
Yes	Yes	Yes
No	No	No

If yes, what is its effect on your CBD? (Circle one answer)

- 1-Beneficial, why _____
- 2-Detrimental, why _____
- 3-No effect, why _____

12. Rate the following features of your CBD at the initial year of your revitalization program and in 1995. Use the following scale to rank the features:

1-Very Good 2-Good 3-Fair 4-Poor 5-Very Poor 6-Not Applicable

<u>CBD Features</u>	<u>Initial year</u>						<u>1995</u>					
Existing downtown employment base for daytime retail and restaurant market	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Public transportation access to a large portion of city population	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Parking facilities	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Retail base	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Low-moderate income housing base (in or near downtown)	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Middle-upper income housing base (in or near downtown)	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Historic buildings offering unique development potential	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Physical condition of sidewalks and infrastructure	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Physical condition of downtown	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Image of central business district	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Private sector organizations (civic organizations)	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Public sector incentives for commercial revitalization	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Public-private partnerships	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6

13. To the nearest \$1,000, what was the size of the CBD revitalization program's operating budget in its initial year and in 1995?

Initial year: _____

1995: _____

14. Indicate in the space provided, the percentage of the revitalization program's financial support that came from each funding source in the initial year and 1995. Be sure that your total percentages sum to 100%.

Initial Year:

Public Funds

Local _____

County/Regional _____

State _____

Federal _____

Other (Briefly describe) _____

Private Funds

Businesses in CBD _____

Other businesses in the community _____

Foundations _____

Fees for services _____

Residents _____

Industry in the community _____

Other (Briefly describe) _____

1995:

Public Funds

Local _____

County/Regional _____

State _____

Federal _____

Other (Briefly describe) _____

Private Funds

Businesses in CBD _____

Other businesses in the community _____

Foundations _____

Fees for services _____

Residents _____

Industry in the community _____

Other (Briefly describe) _____

15. For each category of funding for 1995 please list the source.

List **Local** funding sources & programs:

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

List **County/Regional** funding sources & programs:

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

List **State** funding sources & programs:

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

15. For each category of funding for 1995 please list the source. (continued)

List Federal funding sources & programs:

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

List Other funding sources & programs:

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

16. Check which areas your CBD revitalization program places emphasis and rate your success to date:

Check Areas of Emphasis		Rate Success					N/A	No. of Estimated Projects Cost	
		Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor			
_____	Physical Improvement of Buildings	1	2	3	4	5	6	_____	\$_____
_____	Availability of Building Rehabilitation Finance	1	2	3	4	5	6	_____	\$_____
_____	Physical Improvement of Public Bldg. or Space	1	2	3	4	5	6	_____	\$_____
_____	New Construction Activity	1	2	3	4	5	6	_____	\$_____
_____	Building & Property Sales	1	2	3	4	5	6	_____	\$_____
_____	Availability of Building Construction Finance	1	2	3	4	5	6	_____	\$_____
_____	Parking or Traffic Improvements	1	2	3	4	5	6	_____	\$_____
_____	Improvements to Sidewalks & Curbs	1	2	3	4	5	6	_____	\$_____
_____	Downtown Cleanliness	1	2	3	4	5	6	_____	\$_____
_____	New Business Recruitment	1	2	3	4	5	6	_____	#_____
_____	Business Retention	1	2	3	4	5	6	_____	#_____
_____	Property Developer Recruitment	1	2	3	4	5	6	_____	#_____
_____	Delivery of Municipal Services	1	2	3	4	5	6	_____	\$_____
_____	Public Safety	1	2	3	4	5	6	_____	\$_____
_____	Municipal Attitude	1	2	3	4	5	6	_____	\$_____
_____	Improvement of the Image of Downtown	1	2	3	4	5	6	_____	\$_____

16. Check which areas your CBD revitalization program places emphasis and rate your success to date: (continued)

Check Areas of Emphasis	Rate Success						No. of Estimated Projects Cost	
	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	N/A		
___ Improvement of Retail Shop Variety Downtown	1	2	3	4	5	6	___	\$___
___ Retention or Creation of Specialty Retail District Downtown	1	2	3	4	5	6	___	\$___
___ Special Community Events Downtown	1	2	3	4	5	6	___	\$___
___ Retail Events Downtown	1	2	3	4	5	6	___	\$___
___ Public Relations for Downtown Businesses	1	2	3	4	5	6	___	\$___
___ Job Creation	1	2	3	4	5	6	___	\$___
___ Tax Revenue Generation	1	2	3	4	5	6	___	\$___
___ Control Over Econ. Growth	1	2	3	4	5	6	___	\$___
___ Civic Leadership	1	2	3	4	5	6	___	\$___
___ Public Attitude	1	2	3	4	5	6	___	\$___
___ Volunteer Involvement	1	2	3	4	5	6	___	\$___
___ Strategic Planning Process/Workplan	1	2	3	4	5	6	___	\$___
___ Organizational Development	1	2	3	4	5	6	___	\$___

17. This survey is interested in the activities that assist the CBD revitalization program in addressing areas mentioned above. Please check all activities that apply.

Activities

- ___ Initial assessment of community needs or conditions.
- ___ Partnering with other organizations.
- ___ Promotion -- image building and special events.
- ___ Strategic planning or work plan development.
- ___ Design that enhances visual appeal of CBD.
- ___ Needs update or program evaluation.
- ___ Business assistance services (e.g., technical assistance, architectural services).
- ___ Business and or developer recruitment.
- ___ Major new development project.
- ___ Rehabilitation financing and promotion.
- ___ Public infrastructure construction or rehabilitation.
- ___ Upgrading of city services (e.g., permit process, city street, cleaning, lighting).
- ___ Incentive programs
- ___ Market analysis

17. This survey is interested in the activities that assist the CBD revitalization program in addressing areas mentioned above. Please check all activities that apply.
(continued)

Other: _____

18. If you performed a needs or conditions assessment, which of the following areas were covered?

Please check all that apply.

_____ Traffic/parking study
 _____ Historic preservation inventory
 _____ Business survey or visitation program
 _____ Resident survey
 _____ Economic analysis
 _____ Town meeting/visioning
 _____ Building condition assessments
 _____ Infrastructure and city services
 _____ Other areas: _____

19. Indicate obstacles that have caused problems in implementing the CBD revitalization program. for both the initial year and 1995. Check all items that apply in each time period.

<u>Obstacles</u>	<u>Initial Year</u>	<u>1995</u>
Inadequate public funding for program	_____	_____
Inadequate private funding for program	_____	_____
Lack of private participation (volunteers)	_____	_____
Low level of political support	_____	_____
Community opposition	_____	_____
Poor management of CBD revitalization program	_____	_____
Failure of specific project in program	_____	_____
Other: _____	_____	_____

20. The following is a list of business/program incentives. Please check those available to firms that locate in your CBD. Also indicate how long the incentive has been available and how many firms utilize these incentives.

	Available to Firms locating In CBD	Year established	Number of firms using incentive
Venture capital	_____	_____	_____
Low interest loan pools by local financial institutions	_____	_____	_____
Local grant programs (i.e. Facade, sign, interior)	_____	_____	_____
Historic tax credits (federal)	_____	_____	_____
ISTEA	_____	_____	_____
Other: _____	_____	_____	_____

21. Was a major private or public development project (e.g. a hotel, convention center, office complex, etc.) central to the CBD revitalization program?

1-yes

2-no

If yes, please describe the type of development project: _____

22. Does a review board or historic commission (other than a planning or zoning board) review alterations and new construction to ensure that they are compatible with the image of the CBD?

1-Yes If yes, please describe _____

2-No _____

23. Does a historic district ordinance exist in the CBD?

1-Yes

2-No

24. Aside from historic district ordinances, are there any local ordinances that control design changes?

1-Yes

2-No

If yes, please list them: _____

25. Does the CBD revitalization program provide non-financial design assistance to merchants, property owners, etc.?

1-Yes

2-No

Does the CBD revitalization program offer financial design assistance targeted for making changes to facades, windows, and signs?

1-Yes

2-No

Since the CBD revitalization program began, approximately how many businesses in the CBD have made design changes to facades, windows, signs, etc.? _____

26. Was a public relations (P.R.) campaign developed as a major part of the CBD revitalization program?

1-yes

2-No

If yes, check who the primary audiences were during the initial year and in 1995. Check all that apply.

Primary Audience in Initial Year

___ Residents

___ Tourists

___ Local Businesses

___ Prospective Businesses/Developers

Primary Audience in 1995

___ Residents

___ Tourists

___ Local Businesses

___ Prospective Business/Developers

27. Are coordinated retail sales events part of the current CBD revitalization program?
 1-Yes
 2-No
 If yes:
 How many retail sales events did the CBD revitalization program coordinate in 1995?

How many of these events are annual? _____

28. Are festivals part of the CBD revitalization program?

1-Yes

2-No

If yes:

How many festivals did the CBD revitalization program coordinate in 1995? .

How many of these are annual events? _____

Estimate attendance at the largest festival in 1995? _____

29. Indicate how the following categories have changed since the initial year of your CBD revitalization program to 1995.

	Increasing	Decreasing	No change
<u>Number of Jobs in CBD</u>	_____	_____	_____
<u>Number of Businesses in CBD</u>	_____	_____	_____
<u>Average Rent for Commercial Space in CBD</u>	_____	_____	_____
<u>Occupancy rates for Buildings in CBD</u>	_____	_____	_____

30. List three characteristics of the CBD revitalization program's staff and Board members that are most important to the program's success in dealing with outside entities, such as city agencies, merchants, and community groups.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

31. List three characteristics of the CBD revitalization program's staff and Board members that are most important to the program's internal management.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

32. What skills would improve the management of this program? (e.g., public speaking, more technical expertise, better communications, strategic planning, etc.) ? List up to three.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

33. If you were able to change some aspects of your CBD revitalization program, what would you do differently?

34. What is the single most important benefit of the CBD revitalization program thus far?

35. Any additional comments:

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE!

PLEASE RETURN TO: *Mike Woods*
Room 514, Ag. Hall
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, OK 74078-6026

APPENDIX II
CASE STUDIES

Case Study Methodology

Case studies were used to supplement the survey information and to provide a close up look at the revitalization programs in Oklahoma. Eight case studies were conducted by the investigators. Case study communities included six Main Street Program communities and two Non-Main Street Communities. Individual communities were selected for their unique characteristics in hopes that a review of diverse programs would allow for a better understanding of how and why these programs work.

The first two communities were Duncan and Okmulgee. They represented the two oldest communities in the Main Street Program. Case Study communities were also selected by geographic location. An attempt was made at selecting a distribution of communities that would represent all parts of Oklahoma. Town size was also a factor with selection. Selections were made with population as a criterion, emphasizing various sized communities. Selected communities also have unique characteristics. Okmulgee is unique in its heritage which is strongly tied to the Creek Indian Nation. Duncan is the home of a large oil services company. Cordell and Enid were selected as two Main Street Towns. Both communities are isolated from major thoroughfares. Cordell is a relatively small community in southwest Oklahoma and Enid is a large community (one of Oklahoma's MSAs) located in the northwest. Newkirk was selected because it represented small communities in the Main Street Program and the Oklahoma City Stockyards was selected because it is completely unique. The Stockyards are in Oklahoma City and represent Main Street's urban

program. The two Non-Main Street communities were selected by location and by the quality of responses in the second survey.

Case study interviews were conducted with a format of six areas of questioning: community history, program history, program benefits and results, reasons for the program's success, obstacles facing the program, and other comments. A general format for the case studies was constructed in an attempt to standardize the data common to each community thus allowing the unique characteristics to surface for easy review.

Descriptive data were provided for each community and includes the following: community population (U.S. Bureau of the Census); county population (U.S. Bureau of the Census); county per capita income (Bureau of Economic Analysis, U.S. Department of Commerce); community employment (Oklahoma Department of Commerce); and county employment (Bureau of Economic Analysis, U.S. Department of Commerce).

Community: Billings

County: Noble

Respondents: Jack Graves, Mary Lou Foltz

Address: Route #1, Box 3

County income per capita: 17302

Population: Community: 555

County: 11300

Employment: Community: 218

County: 5430

Program History

The effort in Billings began with the organization of a local historical society. The Billings Historical Society, Inc. is the outgrowth of a small group of citizens brought together in the 1980's by Perry and Barbara Mason. The Renfrow home was a one-of-a-kind pioneer home and there was a need to preserve the home which was built before statehood. Volunteer work and private donations have brought the project to the present stage of successful renovation.

The Billings Historical Society, Inc. was founded in 1982 for the purpose of preserving the property now known as the Renfrow-Miller Museum featuring a very unusual Richardsonian Romanesque style architecture. The property consists of two structures built by a pioneer doctor who participated in the Oklahoma Territory Cherokee Strip Land Run of 1893. The home and adjoining carriage house were completed four years before statehood and have been listed on the National Register of Historic Places since 1984.

In 1993, A Walk Through History, Inc., was created. This is a nonprofit (501 (C) (3) foundation of the Billings Community. It was created and staffed totally by volunteers and is funded by local donations. The purpose of the foundation is to assist in securing funds for various community projects. Original trustees of the organization were Jack Graves, Leland Harris, Willie Waggoner, Shirley Bellman, and H.B. Evans.

These two organizations, The Billings Historical Society and A Walk Through History, Inc., are the primary organizations created to assist with downtown revitalization efforts. Together, they form the basis for local efforts.

Program Benefits and Results

The Renfrow home, now the Renfrow-Miller Museum, has been brought to approximately 85 percent completion in terms of restoration. This has been accomplished with over 5,000 hours of volunteer labor and an expenditure of \$30,000 in donated funds. This is amazing considering the fact that Billings has a population of around 500.

Local sidewalks have been improved by downtown property owners. A gazebo was erected through the sale of bricks. The appearance of the downtown area has been greatly improved. Current activities include development of a museum featuring accomplishments of former Governor Henry Bellmon, a Billings native and current resident.

Reasons for the Programs Success

The local efforts in Billings was successful because local residents identified a

specific project (restoration of the Renfrow home) to support and focus on. Leaders stepped forward to organize and support the project. Volunteers were willing to give time and money because they could see specific results. Once the organizational structures were in place, other projects and needs were identified. The community now has a history of successful action and knows how to approach new projects.

Obstacles Facing the Program

Most resources have come from local support and former residents. Although generous, the limit has been reached. Outside assistance is needed to move forward with new projects. Funding support and technical assistance are sought to help the community move ahead. Local volunteers often have limited time since they have so many other responsibilities so progress can sometimes be slow.

Other Comments

Billings is a small community which has come together to address local needs. Local and former residents care about the community and are willing to volunteer time and money. This is a good example of a small town effort to improve the local quality of life and preserve a heritage.

Community: Cordell

County: Washita

Respondents: Dirk Webb, Robert Goettsch, George Roper

Address: 125 West Main

County income per capita: 15049

Population: Community: 2904

County: 11800

Employment: Community: 1171

County: 4790

Community History

The present day site of New Cordell was settled by J.C. Harrel in 1893. East of this settlement was the town of Old Cordell founded by a homesteader named Tom Jones in 1893. Jones selected two names for the Post Office that was established on his land. Both were already taken so in haste he told the U.S. Postal officials to select any name that was available. The U.S. Postmaster General at the time was named Cordell and hence became the name of the town. Old Cordell was doomed to fail as a community because of its polluted water supply. Old Cordell's water was tainted with gyp, so much that livestock would not drink it. Harrel's land had a clean water supply and was centrally located in Washita county.

In 1897, A.J. Johnson, owner of the land south of Harrel, proposed to Harrel that he clear up the titles of his land and join him in forming a new town. The town site of New Cordell was platted by E.B. Ross shortly after Harrel cleared title to his land. Before residents of Old Cordell new what was going on, Harrel was purchasing

building supplies to construct a post office. Harrel and Johnson also envisioned the movement of the county seat from Cloud Chief to New Cordell. However they were in disagreement as to whose property the court house would be built on. In compromise they decided that the court house would be built on the section line with half of the court house on each of the partner's land.

Cordell developed rapidly and soon began demanding that the court house be moved from Cloud Chief to Cordell. Cordell's citizens argued that their community was more accessible to the entire county. There was an election in 1900 and shortly after, the movement of the county seat was accomplished. Cloud Chief residents did not give up the county seat without a fight. There were legal challenges as well as skirmishes that hindered the movement of the court house. In the end the court house was finally moved to Cordell. It was torn apart and moved to Cordell in pieces. Every last brick, board, and nail made the journey. On December 22, 1900 the City of New Cordell incorporated as an official city with a population of 300 people. In 1905, President Theodore Roosevelt signed a bill which made the 1900 vote to move the court house official.

Today Cordell remains the Washita county seat. Cordell's downtown has suffered as many other Oklahoma towns did with the decline of the agricultural industry. During the late 1970s and 1980s, Cordell's downtown was facing increased vacancies in its buildings. Concerned citizens began to instigate a series of programs and changes in the community to try to improve their community. One such initiation was the application to become a Main Street community.

Program History

Efforts to revitalize downtown Cordell began after a series of bank closures and business failures left Cordell's economy in stagnation. Community leaders began to seek ways to reverse the feeling of apathy felt by many of the communities businessmen and citizens. Downtown revitalization began with the restoration of the First National Abstract building in accordance with guidelines necessary to receive historic tax credits. Civic leaders began investigating other programs which could help to reverse the downward trend of the local economy and community's attitude. These programs included the Main Street Program and Certified Cities program.

The Main Street Program was brought into Cordell with the following goals and objectives: 1. Foremost - renewal. The organizational and promotional aspects of the program can offer the retail merchants a new prospective, allowing them to analyze their strengths and weaknesses, and build a long range approach to capitalize on those strengths and address the weaknesses; 2. With a full-time Main Street Director, trained in the four-point approach, it was pointed out that the Director would have training and networking relationships with others to offer suggested answers to many questions posed by area merchants; 3. A Main Street logo would spice up the print ads and some pre-planning for Christmas decorations and design could help entice more potential customers; 4. Cordell is excited about its design potential with the downtown business district built on a square around the Washita County Courthouse, a historic structure built in 1905 and currently listed on the National Register of Historic Places; 5. The Main Street Program represents an ideal

approach to the rediscovery and preservation of Cordell's unique historical and architectural assets. Main Street aided business owners to enhance their operations giving them ideas to improve their business activities. Main Street also assisted with the design and rehabilitation of building facades.

Certified Cities, a chamber of commerce sponsored project, was beneficial in easing the task of applying and receiving Federal Grants/funding to use on various projects. A group of concerned citizens worried about the health of Cordell and the seemingly negative attitudes of residents. When they approached others about their concerns they discovered many others felt the same. They worked to pass a 1/2 cent sales tax to support the county extension office, establish County Health Services, upgrade the fair grounds, and provide for county capital maintenance. Many of these upgrades would benefit Cordell residents as well as Washita county residents. City leaders are aware of the symbiotic relationship Cordell has with Washita county. These leaders knew programs would benefit Cordell would in some fashion benefit Washita county and vice versa.

The Certified Cities and Main Street Programs brought fresh ideas and enthusiasm into a region stricken with poor attitudes caused by local economic woes. In 1993, Cordell became a Main Street community in hopes of increasing economic activity, promoting historic preservation, and reinstalling pride in the community.

Program Benefits and Results

The cooperative effort between the Main Street Program, Certified Cities program, and civic organizations has produced results in the improvement of the

downtown area. The county was successful in securing a \$60,000 Governor's over-charge fund to repair windows in the Washita County Courthouse. Cordell has also received \$500,000 ISTEA grant for the repair of side walks. Cordell has spent \$100,000 to upgrade the police department and to install a 911 emergency system. They purchased the old theater in downtown and made it into a civic center, and developed a downtown pocket park. Also, one million dollars has been awarded to a private developer to purchase a building downtown and renovate it for use as a senior house complex. The lower floor will be used as a lounge and meeting area while the upstairs will be used as apartments. This will also help with utilizing space in the downtown area.

Another benefit of the downtown revitalization program is the positive change in attitudes in the community. Since efforts began to revitalize downtown, volunteer involvement has increased along with other forms of community involvement. In Cordell there is no one dominant program or organization. Every program/organization works together to accomplish goals that are in the best interest of the town. The Main Street Program brought work sheets with it into the community. These work sheets delegate promotional activity responsibilities and work loads among people, giving many people the chance to provide input into a project.

Reasons for the Program's Success

The major reason for the success of the downtown revitalization program is the unilateral cooperation between the organizations which seek to improve

downtown. The Chamber of Commerce, Certified Cities Program, Main Street Program, Churches, Kiwanis, Rotary, and other civic organizations, as well as the public schools all play an active role in the revitalization of downtown Cordell. Main Street worked with local merchants on improving their business practices. The Certified Cities program worked at improving the quality of life through civic improvements. Cordell's Chamber of Commerce worked with schools and civic groups in the conduction of promotional programs. No one organization plays a dominant role. Members in one organization often belong to another.

Obstacles Facing the Program

Initially there was some competitiveness between the organizations renovating the community. The local economy was a problem. With many bank and businesses closing downtown was left in disarray. While the main street area is currently well occupied, there are some empty buildings. There is no unified design vision and while the expense of major work and the economic realities for current business make physical improvements a long-term goal, the potential is enormous. By unifying property and business owners and educating each other to the long-term economic benefits of design, Cordell hopes to foster a new awareness leads to action.

Sidewalks are in need of repair or replacement in the downtown business district. Post oil boom, Cordell's retail sector has suffered from declining sales. The top priority of the community leadership is to stabilize the retail sector and provide a structure to organize, maintain, and promote Cordell as a vital, attractive community.

Other Comments

Respondents to the case study could not emphasize enough the importance of cooperation between organizations. Currently they have worked out a system which delegates responsibilities among organizations in the accomplishment of a common goal, be it an annual promotional program or a downtown public area improvement.

Community: Davis

County: Murray

Respondent: Buck Wilson, City Manager.

Address: 300 East Main Street

County income per capita:

Population: Community: 2543

County: 12200

Employment: Community: 940

County: 5240

Community History

Davis is a small community located in Murray County, 97 miles south of Oklahoma City on I-35. Here are some important dates in Davis' history. In 1887 the railroad was built through what is today Davis. S.H. Davis built a store next to the railroad and Davis first appeared on the map in 1889. The first post office was built in Davis on March 1, 1890. Davis was incorporated as a town on November 16, 1898. In 1907, the Davis light company was opened and Oklahoma became a state. In 1921 Davis had a professional baseball team. Turner Falls was deeded to Davis on October 21, 1925 and the Turner Falls Park Company was organized. Davis continued to develop as many small communities did. Initially the town was supported by farming activities. Today many of the area residents raise cattle. Davis is unique in that it owns Turner Falls which generates revenue for the city. Turner Falls is a major tourist attraction for the region. There is a story of how the town name became Davis. It is thought when the railroad depot was built, the man who

was painting the building could not read and when it came time to paint the name of the town on the depot he looked upon S.H. Davis's store and painted Davis on the Depot believing it was the name of the town.

Program History

Efforts to revitalize downtown began in 1990. This effort began in order to counter the feeling of apathy among the community. Building owners became content with letting their buildings deteriorate to an unusable condition. In 1989 (approximately), the Cooper Auto Store moved, sending a wake up call to city and community leaders something needed to be done to reverse the decline of downtown Davis. Building revitalization efforts in Davis are carried out by individual building owners. Owners improve their buildings and the city improves public spaces, such as street lights, sidewalks, building a park in a vacant lot, and restoration of the Davis railroad depot. Revitalization efforts are carried out on a pace dictated by the availability of funds. Davis once investigated the possibility of becoming a Main Street town but concluded they did not have the capital to join. The decision was made to encourage local building/business owners to rehabilitate their buildings on a pace decided by individual owners. Building owners would make improvements as funds permitted and the city would make improvements to public spaces. Davis officials looked to Ardmore for suggestions and as a guide for the reconditioning of their downtown. Ardmore is a Main Street community located south of Davis.

Restoration of the Davis Depot began to change the attitude of the community. The Depot building was given to the City if they would move it from its present

location. Instead of moving the Depot, an agreement to lease the land was reached. The City agreed to pay \$1 per year for 99 years. Half of the Depot is used as a civic center and the other half houses the Museum of the Arbuckles. The Depot became a symbol of the community. Soon after its completion, downtown merchants organized and planted trees along Main Street. A section of sidewalk was removed and a tree planted in front of each store. The City Manager planted flowers around the trees to further enhance the project's beauty.

Program Benefits and Results

Efforts to revitalize the downtown have led to increased economic activity in Davis from 1990 to present. In 1990 there were 12 vacant buildings in downtown. Currently there are only two vacant buildings, of which one has been leased and will soon be filled with a business. The overall appearance of downtown has improved with each building restoration. The sign outside of City Hall has "Think Clean Streets" posted for all to read. Restoration of the Davis Depot and other public improvements have caused attitudes to change for the better. People are more involved with what happens in their community. In a small community such as Davis, resources are shuffled between projects, with the most resources going to the project with immediate needs. This shuffling of resources may slow the progress of one project. In Davis the effort to revitalize the downtown is organized by Main Street merchants and city officials. The Chamber of Commerce building is currently undergoing a renovation. Improvements and projects are organized on the grass roots level, ensuring support and whole community involvement.

Reasons for Program's Success

The biggest reason given which explains why Davis has a successful downtown revitalization program is people are willing to work for change. When concerned citizens began to act to save downtown Davis, area merchants and building owners soon realized the importance of making changes necessary to ensure their survival. Davis' program has been successful because of the dedication of key people in the community and the involvement of civic organizations and the city working together to accomplish goals. The area Chamber of Commerce does many things which aids maintaining business vitality. Funding may have stopped Davis from pursuing a formal Main Street Program, but they continue to make improvements on their own pace. Improvements are made as funds allow.

Obstacles Facing the Program

Funding is the largest problem with the downtown revitalization effort. Also the level of cooperation between organizations could be improved. In Davis, as in many other communities, there are still a few people who resist change. Their unwillingness to change can hinder revitalization efforts.

Other Comments

The repair of the Depot and of facades along Main Street are important to Davis because many tourists visit Davis each year. A neat and clean appearance is vital to a community whose vitality is closely tied to the tourist industry.

Community: Duncan

County: Stephens

Respondent: Patsy Garner, Sharon Rhodes

Address: Main Street Duncan, Inc., P.O. Box 112

County income per capita: 15799

Population: Community: 21732

County: 42900

Employment: Community: 8460

County: 16730

Community History

The city takes its name from William Duncan, a merchant who purchased a store along the Chisholm Train from Silas Fitzpatrick in 1872. The store was northeast of the present community on Cow Creek. William Duncan's second wife, Sally Fraker Johnson, was one quarter Chickasaw Indian. With their tribal headright, the Duncans acquired a farm site along the proposed route of the Rock Island Railroad in 1889. By 1890, Duncan moved his store to the present corner of Seventh and Main. By the arrival of the first passenger train on June 27, 1892, a small community had developed on lots laid out by Duncan.

The significance of the railroad in Duncan's history is still evident. The original town site was laid out perpendicular and parallel to the railroad. This accounts for the slightly odd angle of the streets in the older parts of the city. In addition to the railroad, the selection of Duncan as the county seat was important in the emergency of Duncan as the major city in Stephens county. By 1920 the city had

a population of over 3,000.

The early base of Duncan's economy was agriculture. William Duncan's store originally served the needs of ranchers in the area and cattle drives along the Chisholm Trail. The principal cash crop was cotton. Farming and ranching are still important elements in the local economy.

Among the most significant factors in Duncan's history is oil. The first major producing well in Stephens county was established by Magnolia Petroleum in 1918. During the oil boom of the 1920's, Duncan's population grew to over 8,000 residents. Although little oil production occurred in or near the city, Duncan became the industrial and service center for the oil patch. It was in 1921 that Erle P. Halliburton brought his oil well cementing company to Duncan. Halliburton services is now the largest employer in the county. A corporation with international scope, Halliburton provides local employment in oil field services, manufacturing, research, and administration.

During the depression and dust bowl era, Duncan's population continued to grow at a modest rate. However, the agriculture base of the county was severely eroded. Between 1930 and 1940 the remainder of the county lost nearly 3,000 residents. With post WWII prosperity and the discovery of deep oil in 1947, Duncan experienced a second boom. By 1960 the city had grown to over 20,000 residents. In the following two decades, the local growth rate experienced significant ups and downs. During the 1960's, the population declined by almost 300. The community remained fairly stable until the mid 1970s.

A third boom in the local economy began around 1975. Again this was largely related to oil. The energy crisis and international events made Duncan's base in production and oil field services highly valuable. Local unemployment rates averaged 2%, and the physical nature of the city changed dramatically. From 1975 to 1982, almost 2,000 new homes were built. During this period, Highway 81 from Elder Avenue to Plato Road became the center for new commercial activity.

In 1982 the bubble burst as the oil industry declined. Employment declined, home vacancy rates increased as some residents left the area. Duncan's population in 1986 was estimated at 23,500 to 24,000. The unemployment rate increased from 2% in the late 1970s to 8% between 1982 and 1985.

Program History

Duncan experienced difficult times in the early 1980's. Major employees either downsized or closed. In 1985, local leaders including the Mayor, city council, three bank presidents, and the editor of the newspaper became concerned with the building vacancies downtown. Local property owner Patsy Garner was asked to serve as chairperson of a committee to consider what could be done. The National Main Street Conference was held in Missouri and a local Duncan delegation attended. The Main Street Program looked promising since it had a track record and emphasized historical rehabilitation. The program also seemed "honest" in not promising short-term fixes through large dollar expenditures. Later, Ms. Garner researched existing Main Street Programs in Texas and reached a favorable evaluation. Duncan had concluded they would pursue a Main Street revitalization approach when in 1986 they

learned Oklahoma would have a Statewide program. The Main Street Duncan, Inc. organization was formed in 1986 through efforts of the city planner, local banks, property owners, chamber of commerce, and downtown businesses.

Program Benefits and Results

Local leaders noted early that downtown had so many property owners/managers to coordinate-the only way to run a downtown effort was through a program like Main Street. The program also allowed access to technical assistance and provided networking opportunities.

Several major renovation projects have been completed in Duncan including the Patterson Hospital (converted to law offices) and the Palace Theater. Many smaller renovations around town have followed.

Duncan has developed a reputation for "quality" antique stores downtown and attracts Texas shoppers as well as people from all over Oklahoma. Successful Main Street businesses include The Loft, owned and operated by Donna Hunt, and Victory Silks and Tack, owned and operated by Rosella McQuain. Aggressive, responsive merchants have helped to bring a sense of vitality downtown. Working together to make a difference is cited as a principal result of the revitalization effort.

Reasons for the Program Success

Reasons given for the programs success include the ability to employ a full time program manager to oversee day-to-day operations. The balanced four-point approach of the Main Street Program is also cited as an advantage. The program has been fortunate to have continuity on the Board with long-time members helping to

maintain focus.

The State Main Street Program was cited as an important resource. Professional, reliable technical assistance is provided to Duncan. The structure of the program requires reports, plans, and accountability-this helps the local effort in maintaining focus and commitment.

Finally, committed local leaders and merchants is key if a local effort is to succeed. There are people in Duncan who care about what happens downtown and are willing to work together to achieve identified goals.

Obstacles Facing the Program

The economic situation continues to be challenging in Duncan. One major employer is still facing more downsizing. Absentee owners downtown have sometimes been more difficult to involve in revitalization efforts.

Many new merchants have begun a business in Duncan. These merchants do not understand the history of program effort of the last 10 years and will have to be informed and convinced the four-point approach of the Main Street Program will continue to be successful. Marketing the concept of a cooperative effort will always be important.

Other Comments

Duncan has a vital downtown with many unique shopping opportunities. This is impressive given the difficult economic times that have faced the community. Again, committed local leadership seems to be a key ingredient to successful efforts.

Community: Enid

County: Garfield

Respondent: Patty Stallings

Address: P.O. Box 3001

County income per capita: 18496

Population: Community: 45309

County: 57300

Employment: Community: 19100

County: 26200

Community History

Founded in 1893, Enid is the central market center of the Cherokee Strip (NW Oklahoma). Downtown was laid out as a part of the Cherokee Strip and adjoins the historic Government Springs, which was the main watering hole of the Chisholm Trail. Enid has always served as a market center for farming and oil/gas production. Later, manufacturing related to each industry developed. In the 1940s, Vance Air Force Base was built.

Due to inadequate transportation systems, it was isolated until the late 1970s. In the early 1970s, there was a tremendous community expansion from both agriculture and energy. The oil boom from 1975 to 1982, masked the losses of the agricultural community and opening of competitive on base rental at Vance. Since retail sales and gross billings showed little decline, there was no incentive for reevaluation and diversification. In 1978, a local developer began Oakwood Mall. A west site was chosen to cluster all national TV advertising retailers at one location.

In 1978, Downtown Enid Inc. was formed to fight the mall through zoning protests and other tactics.

In 1984 Oakwood mall opened, as did several other large national retailers. From 1982 to 1990 a continual decline in retail sale and gross professional billings was observed. Enid's manufacturing diversification was largely into oil and gas equipment and was almost wiped out. Further problems were caused by reduced Defense spending. In 1987, Enid residents passed a \$0.75 sales tax which funded the refinancing of Phillips University, the Enid Higher Education Program, and the Economic Development Coalition.

Since 1984, Enid has assumed a greater portion of the market share in NW Oklahoma. Retail sales have shown continual gains in the last three years, due substantially to Enid's focused national retail sales and their ability to compete with NW Oklahoma city.

Program History

Enid saw a major mall open in 1984 and many downtown anchor stores moved to the mall. Refinery closings, declining oil prices, and bank closings also occurred during the early 1980's. Downtown Enid, Inc. addressed these economic issues as well. In 1994, application was made to become a Main Street town and Enid was accepted.

Several problems were identified which the central business district had to deal with. There was a lack of organization or planning. Historically, downtown Enid had been the central shopping area for Northwest Oklahoma without having to work

at it. There was widespread apathy or the hope that things would improve on their own. The Main Street Program was seen as a viable answer to these problems.

Program Benefits and Results

A change in attitude has been a chief result of the relatively young program. A sense of community among downtown business people has been renewed. "Enid Lights Up the Plains" is a major festival held in November 1994 for the first time. The festival has been received with great enthusiasm and has spread from downtown to residential areas. Increased positive publicity for Enid and more business activity downtown have also been noted. Enid became a "million dollar Main Street City" during the first year of the program. This means there was over one million dollars reinvested into Main Street by the private sector.

Reasons for the Program Success

Enthusiasm of local volunteers and the quality of their work is cited as a chief reason for program success. Having a work plan was also cited as important. The first year, the workplan was down to satisfy a contract-now the workplan has become relevant and a part of downtown efforts.

These are strong links between the Chamber of Commerce and City Hall. A spirit of cooperation is noted and this helps with the program success. An effective public relations effort has helped to present Enid in a positive light.

The Main Street Program offers a structural approach with technical assistance and training for staff and volunteers. All Main Street towns in Oklahoma have computer linkage through the OK-Net system and this networking allows quick

answers to questions as they arise.

Obstacles Facing the Program

A obstacle noted included the need to continue to try to change attitudes. The program is new so some merchants still need to be convinced "something" can work. Volunteer recruitment is also an issue-business owners are busy and sometimes find it difficult to contribute their time for a community effort.

Other Comments

Main Street Enid is making progress with a relatively new program. The renovation of the Olden Daze Antique Mall and other Enid efforts were reported and pictured in Clem Labines's Traditional Building, a national publication dealing with historical products.

Community: Newkirk

County: Kay

Respondent: Karen Dye

Address: 104 W. Seventh, Newkirk

County income per capita: 19472

Population: Community: 2168

County: 47700

Employment: Community: 986

County: 20990

Community History

On September 16, 1893, a land run opened seven counties in the Cherokee Outlet to homesteaders. Newkirk was designated the county seat for "K" county by the U.S. Government. First the townsite was named Lamoreaux after Silas W. Lamoreaux who was Commissioner of the General Land Office at the time. The citizens were not happy with this designation and promptly voted to change the name of the community to Santa Fe on September 18, 1893. The name Santa Fe was chosen in attempts to entice the railroad to build a depot in the community. The Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe tracks ran the length of the eastern side of the townsite. There are two versions of why the name Santa Fe was not kept. One version insists the post office vetoed the name Santa Fe. Another suggests the railroad itself rejected the name. However, the railroad continued to influence the naming of Newkirk. There was a cattle shipping point named Kirk two miles north of the townsite and on November 8, 1893 an election was held and the name Newkirk

was selected receiving three hundred ten votes.

Newkirk's entire business district was placed on the National Register in 1984 as a historic district. Newkirk has one of the most intact streetscapes in Oklahoma. Many of Newkirk's downtown buildings were constructed of native limestone which was quarried a few miles east of town. The predominant architecture of these limestone buildings is known as Plains Romanesque. The later buildings constructed in the 1920s and 1930s were built of brick and in the Plains Commercial design. Newkirk faced a dilemma in November, 1990. Many of the historic buildings were targeted for demolition. A movement was started to save the buildings in the downtown area.

The economy in Newkirk was at a low in 1987-88. Residential occupancy was at a low along with commercial occupancy during these years. The downtown was affected by this reduction in activity. Downtown lost a coin operated laundry, a dry goods store, OTASCO, and a cafe. Economic trends began to improve from 1989-92. During this time the downtown gained a CPA firm, three antique stores, a gift and western clothing store, country gifts and florist, auto glass installation, real estate agency, a public accounting firm, city police department, and a classic automobile restoration shop. During the period from the November, 1990 to 1992, there has been an interest in saving the downtown both historically and economically. Absentee ownership and owners who use their buildings for storage were additional problems facing the Newkirk downtown. Some building owners were using their buildings for storage and were not interested in selling the buildings at a fair market price. The

fact the downtown was designated a historic district and there was some local interest in preserving the downtown, helped the community qualify in 1992 to become one of the first small towns in the Oklahoma Main Street Program.

Program History

During November 1990 a group of concerned citizens began to organize in an effort to address the possible demolition of the buildings of the downtown. The group was known as the "SOBs," an acronym which meant Save Our Buildings. One of the initiators of the SOBs was Karen Dye, a native of Newkirk and concerned citizen. In 1989 Karen met with Ron Frantz (Architect for the Oklahoma Main Street Program) at a preservation conference. He suggested she contact the National Trust about a matching grant for a structural engineer. The SOBs were volunteers organized to raise money to save the downtown buildings from demolition. In one example they made an agreement with a building owner if they raised enough money to pay the back taxes on the building it would be deeded over to the Newkirk Community Historical Society. They raised the necessary money to pay the back taxes and proceeded to repair the building. The building was sold with the understanding it could not be modified in a way that would degrade its historic appearance. In 1992, the Oklahoma Legislature funded the Small Town section of the Oklahoma Main Street Program. Newkirk was one of the first three towns selected for the small town program.

Newkirk applied to the Main Street Program with the intention of strengthening its effort to revitalize its downtown. The main goal was to prevent the

destruction of the historic buildings in the downtown area. Other goals included: to encourage new businesses to locate in the downtown and provide support for existing ones; to repair buildings; to encourage Newkirk residents to trade in the community; raise community spirit; increase the community's potential as a recreation hub and as a bedroom community; and to bring focus and direction for the community. Newkirk was declared as a historic district in 1984.

Program Benefits and Results

Since the inception of the Main Street Program, Newkirk has had 40 facade renovations totaling \$80,291 reinvested. Sixty two buildings have undergone other types of renovation representing \$383,314 in reinvestment. Before the Main Street Program, the talk in the local coffee shop declared buildings in the downtown would never sell, today 19 have sold and are being put to use. The program offers a \$500 grant for the repair of upper windows for storefronts and 39 have participated in the grant program. All of these are benefits which are visible, the Main Street Program also has made improvements in areas not so easily seen. Civic pride and the community's perception of its self are up. One word which may have described the community, before there was a push to revitalize downtown, is apathy. Many residents were willing to accept the status quo. Today there is a better sense of community pride which has led to an increase in leadership and volunteering on the local level.

Reasons for the Programs Success

The people involved with the revitalization project from the formation of the SOBs to Main Street volunteers, have had an instrumental affect on the success of the

Newkirk downtown revitalization effort. People organized from the grass roots level to save their downtown from demolition. They raise their funds locally and receive technical assistance from the State. Another reason the program has been successful is the assistance provided by the Oklahoma Main Street Program. The Main Street Program and its staff have provided assistance with obstacles facing the Newkirk program. The Newkirk program also has a good working relationship with city government (which funds half of the Newkirk program). It is important for city officials to see the importance of a Main Street Program and to share in the program's vision. The design segment of the program is viewed to be the strongest part of the Newkirk Main Street Program.

Obstacles Facing the Program

Initially the program was facing the possible destruction of some buildings in the downtown area. Other problems were related to ownership of the buildings, absentee ownership and owners using buildings for storage represented problems for the downtown. Initially the negative attitude in the community was a problem. People were willing to let the downtown deteriorate and when a change element was introduced they were reluctant to rally behind change.

Presently the program faces a possible financial problem. Newkirk is primarily a farming community and the recent drought combined with low cattle prices, have led to reduced economic activity in the community. Newkirk is also subject to economic changes in Ponca City, which is the site for the county's major employer. The employer, a Conoco refinery, has announced a series of lay-offs. These problems could spill over to affect the Newkirk program's funding. Economic

restructuring has been the weakest part of the Newkirk program. Also the downtown area is recovering from a hail storm which has damaged many windows in the downtown area.

Other Comments

Newkirk program officials have learned the value of alumni support for a community. They have discovered an attachment and fondness former residents have for their native community. Smaller communities have a bond with their residents that is not present in many larger cities.

Community: Okmulgee

County: Okmulgee

Respondent: Nolan Crowley

Address: P.O. Box 609 Okmulgee

County income per capita: 14099

Population: Community: 13441

County: 37800

Employment: Community: 4684

County: 13630

Community History

Okmulgee's history did not begin in Oklahoma. The history of Okmulgee began in 1836 when 14,500+ Creek Indians left Georgia on a hard death ridden journey west. Creek Indians began arriving in and around the present day site of Okmulgee in 1837. By 1867, there were 44 towns in the Creek Nation. The Creek Nation capital was established with a permanent site selected near the Deep Fork river. Following the site selection, discussion about an appropriate name for the capital was held with the name 'Okimulgis' selected as the name of the capital. "Oki" meaning water, "Mulgis" meaning it is boiling. It was spelled Ocmulgee until 1869 when a post office was established and the spelling was changed to Okmulgee. In 1869, the original Creek Council House was constructed. It was a double-log, two story structure consisting of six rooms.

Businesses began to appear in Okmulgee during the 1870s. Captain Frederic Severs and Columbus Belcher operated a "first store" in 1873. There were seven

stores established during the 1870s. Okmulgee's population was 4,000 by 1904 and oil fields brought wealth into the area and Okmulgee prospered. New construction dominated the landscape with a new City Hall, hospital, the Hippodrome (which was world famous and included a theater, swimming pool, and a dance hall), new churches, and posh hotels. At the close of the 1920s, Okmulgee was the sixth largest city in the State with a population of nearly 25,000, and boasted of the largest concentration of millionaires in the nation.

As with much of the nation, Okmulgee's golden era would come crashing down with the occurrence of the Great Depression and with abundant new oil driving the price of oil down to almost nothing. Once wealthy oilmen were now hard pressed for cash, banks were hit hard, unemployment soared, and Okmulgee's population dwindled as the oil industry moved to Tulsa. During the 1940s, Okmulgee's population became stable as did the economic base, primarily agriculture, gas, and the glass industry. In the late 1950's, a new four lane highway connected Okmulgee to Tulsa cutting the travel time between the two cities to less than an hour. By the end of the 1960s, Okmulgee was like many other Oklahoma towns, a nice community which was convenient to a large city but lacking personal identity.

During the 1970s, Okmulgee's economic base became less dependant on agriculture and the glass industry. Kelco Manufacturing opened a \$40 million plant in 1976 and Wal-Mart opened their store south of town. Downtown's trade volume began to decline, so a group of citizens completed a downtown plan in 1978 when they realized the status quo would result in further trade loss. During the 1980s, the

downtown lost four anchor stores when they closed and lost six buildings in a fire. In 1981 a new City Hall complex was built and citizens approved a sales tax increase. By 1983, Southwestern Bell Telephone, Oklahoma Natural Gas, Public Services of Oklahoma, and First National Bank all moved out of the Downtown core area. The Okmulgee task force on community development was formed that same year and by 1984, merged with the Chamber of Commerce.

Program History

The idea for a downtown revitalization effort started when the area faced a revenue loss due to a decline in the oil and gas industry. Downtown was losing merchants as they followed trends of locating in strip malls and shopping centers. Okmulgee applied to the Oklahoma Main Street Program in 1986. There were two groups that led the drive for change, the Chamber of Commerce and the Merchants Association. Although they spearheaded the effort, the entire community was very supportive of the idea. The main goal was to revive the downtown area. More specifically their objectives were: To create an organization that can give unified direction to the Okmulgee main street area; identification of key leadership in the Okmulgee main street area; educate the community regarding the importance of the economic advantages to having a viable Okmulgee downtown business district; through the use of outside assistance and guidance, a public/private partnership will be created for the enhancement of the Okmulgee main street area; assist with a unified promotion effort; improve building appearances to bring out Okmulgee's own historic design; promote new and adaptive use of present building stock; improve the

Okmulgee main street streetscapes; retention/recruiting of commercial activities in the Okmulgee main street area; development of business management techniques; development of coordinated competitive marketing promotion by Okmulgee Main Street Program participants. Okmulgee hoped to make the downtown viable by bringing people back to the downtown to shop or to participate in social activities. They wanted to stop the exodus of businesses from the downtown area. Originally the program's funding was 100 percent private, currently the program receives approximately 40 percent of its funding from the city. Okmulgee's revitalization efforts are continuously ongoing with activities spreading outward from the downtown to include other historic structures.

Program Benefits and Results

Okmulgee's downtown has benefitted from the Main Street Program in many areas. There has been a steady increase in sales tax revenue during the last four years, which is impressive considering the community lost its largest employer during the same time period. Since the beginning of its program, 62 buildings have had their facades renovated representing a total of \$930,200 invested. There have been 160 other building rehabilitation projects and new construction for a total of \$4,931,925 invested. Building sales have increased with 49 buildings being sold since the program's initialization. Total private sector reinvestment has been \$8,550,925 since 1986. Okmulgee's Main Street Program has contributed to 123 business openings, relocations, and expansions with a net gain in business openings, relocations, and expansions of 96 businesses. There has been a net gain of 167 jobs created in the

downtown. There have been six public improvement projects for a total of \$1,609,520 invested.

Other benefits include a museum renovation downtown, renovation to City Hall, a library renovation, and the development of a historic preservation district and City ordinance that sets guidelines for building renovations and new building construction. The downtown has an occupancy rate of 85 percent which represents 90 percent of the space which is currently usable. Okmulgee's program has received State and national recognition. The average building sales price has increased from \$15,000 to \$20,000-\$30,000. Another benefit is the development of a tourist industry in Okmulgee as tourists come to see the renovated downtown and museum.

Reasons for the Program's Success

Two main reasons for Okmulgee's success are its volunteers and members. Volunteers are the back bone to Okmulgee's Main Street Program. Volunteers work all of the festivals and come to all of the committee meetings. They are involved with every aspect of the program and are always more than willing to assist when their help is needed. Another large reason for the program's success is its members. Members renovate their buildings and reinvest a lot of money in their buildings for the future. Both groups are equally important with their roles in the program and without the level of involvement from each group, the program would not be as successful as it is today.

Obstacles Facing the Program

Historically, funding has been a problem facing the Okmulgee Main Street Program. Currently the program faces only a few problems with the primary

problem being complacency. Program leaders feel they must guard against the tendency of reducing their efforts following success. It is thought they must continue to progress with new projects in new areas and maintain the growth of the downtown rather than sustain what has been accomplished to date.

Other Comments

The Main Street Program has changed Okmulgee for the better. Main Street has made people aware of downtown and how important it is, after all "you can't have a parade in a strip mall or shopping center." Downtown is now a destination, a place where people come to be involved in social activities. Promotions, design, economic restructuring, historic preservation are all vital to a downtown revitalization effort, but another important part of Okmulgee's success comes from the additional information available to official Main Street towns through the State Program.

Community: Stockyards City

County: Oklahoma

Respondent: Jeri Montgomery

Address: Room 118 Oklahoma City Stockyards Exchange Building

County income per capita: 20337

Population: Community: 358 housing units (274 single and 84 multiple units)

County: 625300

Employment: County: 291830

Community History

Amid much pageantry, Oklahoma City's first major industry began on October 3, 1910, when Edward Morris and Company formally opened a packing plant and attendant stockyards. For Oklahoma City, this represented the culmination of substantial effort by the Chamber of Commerce and Civic leaders to attract industry. In the Daily Oklahoman of October 8, 1910, the Morris Company advertised for 15 businesses to locate in "Packing Town." Included in the list were requests for a hay market, cotton compress, cotton gin, wagon factory, harness factory, and "all sorts of stores." On October 13, 1910, the Daily Oklahoman announced a proposed housing development, Morrisville, at Reno and Pennsylvania. Lots were offered for \$150-300, with a guarantee if they were not connected to other parts of the city by electric car in 90 days there money would be refunded. This multi-million dollar investment, the largest and most modern livestock enterprise constructed at one time, became Oklahoma City's largest employer and remained so for many years.

A major change occurred in the 1960s as the large packing plants began to slowly close their slaughtering operations. Over the span of the next 20 years, both of the giant packing houses ceased their packing operations and the name "Packing Town" became a misnomer. Also during this same time frame, the stockyards became the prominent market in the nation and it was only natural for the area to become known as Stockyards City.

Stockyards City is truly a city within a city. Conservative in their business practices, independent by nature of their type of business, the Stockyards operation and the surrounding commercial area is a unique segment of the Oklahoma business community.

Program History

Initially Stockyard merchants sought to improve the Stockyards area without hindering the operations of the actual cattle market. Area merchants formed the Stockyards City Council to work on building repair, signage, and other improvements. The group met with limited success in promoting the Stockyards. One day while in transit, Carroll Monden heard Susie Clinard (Director of the Oklahoma Main Street Program) speaking on the radio about the Main Street approach to revitalization. He concluded this was what the Stockyards needed to do to revitalize the area. Support for the idea grew as money was raised to pay for a National Main Street Center assessment visit. The National Main Street Center visited the area in 1989 and made suggestions for revitalization efforts. Later in 1989, the Stockyards made an application to join the Oklahoma Main Street Program,

but there was no urban program in the Oklahoma Main Street Program. In 1990 the Stockyards began raising money for a contract with the National Main Street Program. The Stockyards was going to pursue a direct contract with the National Main Street center if there was no program offered at the State level.

In 1990, the Oklahoma Main Street Program asked the State Legislature for matching funds to establish an urban main street program. The State Legislature approved funding for an urban program in 1991. In 1991, the Stockyards applied for official status with the Oklahoma Main Street Program and with the National Main Street Center. Oklahoma City approved funding of \$50,000 per year, on a year by year basis, with the understanding the program would take 3-5 years to develop. The Stockyards became the first Urban Main Street Program in Oklahoma during 1992.

Program Benefits and Results

During the first year of operation (1992), the Stockyards realized a net increase of seven new businesses, 20 new jobs, 21 facade renovations, 37 other renovation projects, one building sold, and five public improvement projects. Total private reinvestment was \$404,007 in 1992. In 1993 the Stockyards realized a total of nine new businesses or expansions, 40 net new jobs created, four facade renovations, 11 other building improvement projects, and one public improvement project. Private reinvestment for 1993 totaled \$203,900. In 1994 the Stockyards saw 17 net new businesses or expansions, 25 net new jobs created, six facade renovations, and five other building improvement projects. Total private reinvestment for 1994 was \$281,650. In 1995 the Stockyards realized four net new businesses or

expansions, 38 net new jobs created, two facade renovations, and two other building improvement projects. Total private reinvestment for 1995 was \$650,000.

Non-visible improvements lie in the areas of leadership and support from local merchants and officials. The Main Street Program has improved the organization of the revitalization effort of the Stockyards area. The program has also been instrumental in the honing of local citizens into leaders capable of accomplishing many tasks.

Reasons for the Programs Success

Stockyard official were well trained by the Oklahoma Main Street staff and by the National Main Street Center. The two programs gave examples of strong leadership which was carried through to the Stockyards program. Also the Stockyards benefitted from people willing to take on leadership roles and raise money. People involved with the Stockyards realized the value of having a full time program manager and were very supportive of the idea. Goals and objectives of the program were: to create economic vitality; to increase people traffic; to increase profile and image by linking the area to the heritage of the cattle and horse industry; to create the organization to achieve these goals; to improve the physical appearance of the area; to promote and market the Stockyards City area; to improve and diversify the business climate in the area; to diversify business mix by attracting new complementary businesses to vacant properties; to strengthen the business practices of the existing businesses through resource sharing; to create employment opportunities for residential neighbors; to establish a range of activities and entertainment linked to

the area's western heritage; to establish management responsible to the interest of the project area, in order to coordinate and add cohesion to the many facets of a successful program.

Obstacles Facing the Program

Because of its continued reliance on the agricultural sector, Stockyards City has experienced little growth during the late 1980s. Due to the trend of livestock producers selling their animals at local sales and the decline in overall livestock numbers in Oklahoma and the Southwest, a streamlining and restructuring of the stockyards and the commission firms operating there has resulted. Because the stockyards business is based on a volume type operation, the lack of receipts has significantly hampered any major capital improvement projects for the foreseeable future. Because of this trend, the business district progressively receives less rural traffic exposure.

Other Comments

It was emphasized a good working relationship with the Board of Directors and good communication with the Board is crucial to any programs success. Currently the Stockyards enjoys this cordial relationship with its governing board. Also it was noted initial improvements in appearance of buildings will attract support for a Main Street Program. The visual improvements are something people can see and when they can see it (the program) working they will be more apt to rally behind its efforts.

APPENDIX III
INDIVIDUAL COMMUNITY RESPONSES

These are individual responses to questions on the second/detailed survey. These responses lent themselves to categorization and grouping. However, many of these individual responses have valuable information and contribute to the spirit of this paper. Headings from the question asked appear above each Table of Responses.

TABLE A1

What is the name of the group which managed the CBD in the initial year and 1995?

Name of Group

Ada Main Street
City of Alva
Ardmore Main Street Program
City of Atoka
Bethany Main Street, Inc.
A Walk Through History, Inc.
Mainstreet Facade Renovation Loan Committee
Checotah Main Street
Downtown Merchants
Main Street Cordell, Inc.
Private
Main Street Duncan, Inc.
El Reno Main Street Program
DEI (Downtown Enid, Inc.)
Town of Grayson
Hooker Main Street Program
Citizens for Better Hulbert
Miami Main Street
Mountain View Main Street
Newkirk Main Street Authority
Nowata's Historic Main Street
Board of Directors and 2 paid Staff Members
Okmulgee Main Street
Main Street Pawhuska
Main Street
Ponca City Main Street
Prague Chamber of Commerce
Purcell Chamber of Commerce and City Hall
City of Sand Springs
Sapulpa Main Street
Downtown Stillwater Main Street
Chamber of Commerce
Main Street Stroud
Woodward Main Street, Inc.

TABLE A1 (continued)
What is the name of the group which managed the CBD in the initial year and 1995?

Name of Group

Ada Main Street
Ardmore Main Street Authority
City of Atoka
Bethany Main Street, Inc.
A Walk Through History, Inc.
Mainstreet Facade Renovation Loan Committee
Checotah Main Street
Chickasha Chamber of Commerce
Main Street Cordell, Inc.
Private Organizations
Main Street Duncan, Inc.
El Reno Main Street Program
Main Street Enid, Inc.
Town of Grayson
Hooker Main Street Program
Miami Main Street
Mountain View Main Street
Newkirk Main Street Authority
Nowata's Historic Main Street
Board of Directors and 2 paid Staff members
Okmulgee Main Street
Pawhuska Chamber of Commerce
Perry Main Street
Ponca City Main Street
Main Street Prague
Purcell Main Street Program
Sand Springs Main Street, Inc.
Sapulpa Main Street
Downtown Stillwater Main Street
Chamber of Commerce
Main Street Stroud, Inc.
Woodward Main Street, Inc.

TABLE A2

Characteristics of the CBD revitalization program's staff and board members that are most important to the program's success in dealing with outside entities, such as city agencies, merchants, and community groups.

Diverse
Professional
Committed
Cooperative efforts of volunteers.
Goals and objectives are shared.
Positive publicity.
Concentrate our efforts in designated area.
Able to offer free technical services.
Have a part-time program manager.
Planning
Funding
Volunteers
Open communication between all entities.
Willingness to listen, coordinate, and sometimes compromise.
Enthusiasm-it is contagious and others will follow our lead.
Sponsoring events to bring shoppers downtown.
Showing of all buildings for lease/sale.
Referee for arguments among retailers.
Soliciting funds.
Communications
Business recruitment.
Great advantage in being a part of the city staff-everyone helps.
Our Board of Directors represents a broad base of the whole community.
Best volunteer corps in the world-The "Main Street Maniacs" are crazy about Sand Springs! (The wind beneath our wings!!)
Participation and support from banking institutions and city government.
Input from property owners and business leaders from the CBD.
Positive attitude and a vision for making a positive impact with the potential that exists.
Dedication
Vision
Positive Attitudes.
Willing to work on projects.
Knowing who to talk to.
Enthusiasm
Flexibility
Organizational skills.
Communication skills.
Positive attitude concerning Stockyards City.
Promote Stockyards City as a safe place to shop and eat.

TABLE A2 (continued)

Characteristics of the CBD revitalization program's staff and board members that are most important to the program's success in dealing with outside entities, such as city agencies, merchants, and community groups.

Promote Main Street program's 4 point approach for success in downtown revitalization.
Volunteer spirit.
Work ethic.
Wisdom
Informed-knowing what we have and what we can offer.
Professional-presenting yourself and being accepted as a professional organization with
work plans and goal oriented.
Enthusiasm-believing in what you're doing.
Enthusiasm
Credibility-Visual improvements to downtown that are a direct result of Main Street
program.
Communication with community.
Board represents cross-section of community.
Successful fund raising.
Positive attitude.
Motivation
Tenacity
Leaders in community.
Credibility
Flexibility
Communication
Knowledge
Education
Enthusiasm
Communication
Knowledge/training
Willingness to work together towards goals.
Always aware of what is going on in the entire community.
Open minded attitude.
Full time program manager.
4-point approach of organization, promotion, design, and economic restructuring.
Enthusiasm
Main Street approach.
Professional help from outside town.
Outgoing
Positive
Visionary
Visionary
Optimistic

TABLE A2 (continued)

Characteristics of the CBD revitalization program's staff and board members that are most important to the program's success in dealing with outside entities, such as city agencies, merchants, and community groups.

Tenacious
Housing
Appearance of downtown area.
Education
Enthusiasm
Persistence
Vision
Board members keep CBD informed on projects.
CBD are on the board.
Project programs announcements in local paper.
Spirit of volunteerism.
Positive attitude.
"We can make a difference".
Well-trained and educated through Oklahoma Main Street.
Good public relations skills.
Willingness to take responsibility and work.

TABLE A3
Characteristics of the CBD revitalization program's staff and board members
that are most important to the program's internal management.

Organizational skills.
 Computer skills.
 Communication skills.
 Positive attitude.
 Working together.
 City of Atoka is managing project.
 OSU staff assistance.
 Vision
 Organization
 Enthusiasm
 Housing
 Appearance of downtown area.
 Education
 Professional
 Organized
 Self discipline
 Enthusiasm
 Vision, planning, work plan.
 Strong board of directors.
 Full time program manager.
 State staff
 4-point main street approach.
 Awareness of problems affecting downtown and the community.
 Staying focused on short and long range plans.
 Willingness to work together and with others to improve downtown.
 Organization
 Communication
 Good equipment
 Communication
 Leadership
 Training
 Business minded individuals.
 Professional
 Wide range of talents and knowledgeable.
 Communication
 Flexibility
 Enthusiasm
 Dedication
 Organization
 Work plans

TABLE A3 (continued)
Characteristics of the CBD revitalization program's staff and board members
that are most important to the program's internal management.

Communication between all the committee and board.
 Reliability, knowing others are taking care of their part in order to make the "whole" success.
 Enthusiasm, believing in what you're doing
 Wisdom
 Work ethic
 Volunteer spirit
 Work together as a team
 Work toward the same goals
 Maintain a healthy organization
 Organizational skills
 Communication-skills
 Flexibility
 Willing to go by the rules
 Willing to work on problems
 Don't pass the buck
 Commitment
 Cooperation
 Education
 Financial planners
 Creativity
 Organizers
 They all live in and love Sand Springs
 All are extremely involved in community affairs
 All are downtown property and/or business owners and are fully dedicated to the CBD revitalization
 Short staff
 Inadequate funds
 Volunteer commitment
 Enthusiasm!
 Willingness to plan-work plans are essential
 Have to be a visionary, keep the programs vision as a primary goal
 "Active" support of community and city officials
 All committees develop work plans
 Board members serve on a committee
 Program manager to facilitate and coordinate
 Strong leadership
 Creative
 Resourceful
 Available

TABLE A4
What skills would improve the management of this program?

"Back to the Basics" training after year 5.
 Larger staff.
 Better planning.
 More money.
 Strategize planning.
 Fundraiser
 More technical expertise.
 More expertise in obtaining funding.
 More technical expertise on historical renovations as concerns method of reconstruction,
 products available for renovations and how to apply or incorporate their use, and
 contractors available for specific techniques.
 Time management.
 Organizational management.
 Personal development.
 Better communications with media.
 Tell the public sector what we do and how well we do it.
 Design expertise.
 Strategic planning.
 Public speaking.
 Any educational workshops/seminars closer to Panhandle (limited to one day)-very
 difficult to attend a workshop and not spend at least two days away.
 More technical expertise.
 Grant writing.
 Strategic planning.
 Technical expertise.
 More support by board and committee, not expecting manager to "do it all".
 Training on working with volunteers.
 Continue attending training from Oklahoma Main Street.
 Organizational training.
 Better communication.
 Business plan.
 More technical expertise.
 Grant writing skills-knowledge of outside fund.
 Public speaking.
 More strategic planning.
 More promotion directed at specified targets.
 Advice from an architect.
 Strategic planning, especially, promotion oriented.
 Design expertise leading the design community.
 Membership drive leadership.
 Better "stress management" skills!

TABLE A4 (continued)
What skills would improve the management of this program?

Technical skills re: Business plans and budgets.
 Organization skills to challenge a focused direction for committee chairs and members.
 Communication
 Strategic planning.
 Money to operation.
 More volunteer involvement.
 Increased involvement from outside the CBD.
 More cooperation from local government.
 Better communication.
 Better volunteer recruitment.
 More community involvement.
 Strategic planning.
 Organization.
 Communications.
 Strategic planning for membership recruitment.
 More expertise in seeking grant money for projects.

TABLE A5

If you were able to change some aspect of your CBD revitalization program,
what would you do differently?

Increased funding by city.

Increase staff.

Institute changes desired, not just the impressive changes.

Do it right the first time!

Estimates for project were too low.

Obtain deeper sources of funding.

Larger P.R. effort to keep people informed of progress.

Apply for more public funding through grant writing.

Streamlined the loan process in the initial year instead of second year.

More funding would be secured for the establishment of cash reserves equal to one year's operation of Checotah Main Street.

Add secretarial staff.

Slow down-Not do as much-Pace is too fast for some to absorb the change and staff and board to keep up.

Change retailer's attitudes!

Go back to each town or city and list any historic sites and buildings that are not recorded.

Have all vacant lots available to rent or for sale.

More building in downtown.

I'd pursue additional funding sources.

Need more dedicated volunteers and more funds.

Main Street programs have the same type of goals but are very individualized from town to town. I would like to see in Nowata a different outlook of people who sit on the board. I think a plan of putting a certain number of volunteer hours before being able to sit on the board. This would allow time to learn of program and also prove of you're willingness to be a "doer". A core group of people in a CBD program (such as the local board members are to Main Street) that are goal oriented and enthusiastic about the program is key. I would also like to point out that workplans are crucial in accomplishing goals for many reasons. Some including: they keep you on track, they help you plan ahead, when raising money for grants or memberships, they help others understand your goals for the upcoming year. If used properly they can really be the resource that keeps the program on track.

Spirit in downtown. We participated from 1987-1990 in the Oklahoma Main Street Program. There is now a small cities program.

We really feel that if we had participated in the Small Cities Program (under 5,000 population) we could have preserved our resources and participated for a longer time.

Have more money to spend.

More citizen participation.

Historic preservation/historic district ordinances-first year.

TABLE A5 (continued)
If you were able to change some aspect of your CBD revitalization program,
what would you do differently?

Better organization with more volunteer help in the earliest stages of the program.
Increase the budget and include a staffed administration assistant.
It is extremely difficult for one person to stay "on track" when there is so much to do
on a every day basis.
More emphasis on business recruitment.
Increase funding.
We have too much paper work and reports to fill out, we do not have sufficient time for
all these.
It has been perceived as a merchants organization from the beginning. We are working
to change that image but after seven years it is hard to change those perceptions.
It should have been marketed as a community organization from the beginning.
Change the way we work with property owners. Now they look at who can pay the rent
rather than who can do the business.
If funding were available we would hire someone to market CBD retail merchants
program.
Have a successful on-going membership drive.

TABLE A6
What is the single most important benefit of the CBD revitalization program, thus far?

Gain a business.
Downtown Ardmore is alive!
DOT funding.
OSU assistance.
Full occupancy of DT commercial spaces.
A catalyst to revitalize the downtown/Main Street Area.
Community awareness of historic preservation.
Renewed enthusiasm in the community. Pride in their town again!
City image
Working together to make a difference!
Comprehensive program that builds incrementally and uses all our elements to downtown revitalization, promotion, design, economic restructuring and organization.
The renewal of a sense of community among downtown business people.
Received a \$5,000 grant.
Brings the community together and gives us more strength in numbers to attain goals.
Community involvement and attitude, community growth, overall community involvement, more available resources.
Increased downtown attitude.
Community pride
Change in attitude of community from one of apathy to a positive outlook!
Increase business openings downtown. Improvements leading to more community pride.
Spirit in downtown.
The program has brought the people of SYC together, working toward a common goal.
When people work together, eventually there are visual changes and improvements, etc.
Even though we didn't continue with the Oklahoma Main Street Program, our participation was very beneficial. It allowed our community to gain skills for our board members which continue on today. It also gave our community a great education about how much we have to proud of.
Getting people to look at their downtown differently and helping to preserve the past by renovating of the building.
Saving and being catalyst for restoration of the Theater.
It has proved that the citizens of Prague are willing to work and do whatever is necessary to meet the needs of the CBD and make the most of the potential that exists because of our location and increase in population.
The pride in downtown is back-community wide. The heart of our city is alive and well again! Everyone has felt a part of this program.
Positioning of CBD for the future growth and success.
Building community pride and a park.

TABLE A6 (continued)
What is the single most important benefit of the CBD revitalization program, thus far?

It has unified the merchants. They are all working toward a common goal, revitalizing downtown. It has also resulted in a change of attitude in the merchants and in the community.

New improved attitudes.

A continuing present and being available to work and talk with the community anytime.

Created awareness of strengths and weaknesses of that area.

We have a vital downtown-our CBD is full of business. It is a hub.

TABLE A7
Additional Comments

The Oklahoma Main Street Program has been invaluable in this process!

The main thing I've learned is enthusiasm is key in accomplishing anything. If your volunteers want to see it happen, are motivated enough to see it happen, it will happen!

Being doers and not just talkers are important. After a while people want to see action. You have to constantly remind people in community where you've been, where you are and where you're going.

Main Street has done a lot to improve downtown.

The main street program is extremely beneficial to Perry, in helping us to find ways to do things!

Being involved with the application for the Oklahoma Main Street Program, this survey comes at a time when we are consumed with other paper work and expecting a visit from the Department of Commerce.

I have enclosed a copy of our total reinvestment figures (any questions please call). I have also enclosed brochures for our Loan Program, Paint Grant and Sign Grant Brochures. Our membership/Business directories have just gone to the printer.

Please send anything that would be of help to improve our program-we are just getting started.

APPENDIX IV
VARIABLE DESCRIPTION

TABLE B1
List of Variables Used in the Regression Analysis

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Description</u>
X1	Public group
X2	Private group
X3	Citizen group
X4	Other management group
X5	Program board of directors
X6	Elected board members
X7	Appointed board members
X8	Both elected and appointed
X9	Budget size
X10	Local
X11	County/regional
X12	State
X13	Federal
X14	Other funding sources (public)
X15	Businesses in the CBD
X16	Other businesses in the community
X17	Foundations
X18	Fees for services
X19	Residents
X20	Industry in the community
X21	Other funding sources (private)
X22	Physical improvement of buildings
X23	Availability of building rehabilitation finance
X24	Physical improvement of public buildings or space
X25	New construction activity*
X26	Building and property sales
X27	Availability of building construction finance
X28	Parking and traffic improvements
X29	Improvements to sidewalks and curbs
X30	Downtown cleanliness*
X31	New business recruitment
X32	Business retention
X33	Property developer recruitment
X34	Delivery of municipal services
X35	Public Safety
X36	Municipal attitude*
X37	Improvement of the image of downtown
X38	Improvements of retail shop variety
X39	Retention or creation of specialty district downtown
X40	Special community events downtown

TABLE B1 (continued)
List of Variables Used in the Regression Analysis

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Description</u>
X41	Retail events downtown
X42	Public relations for downtown businesses
X43	Job creation
X44	Tax revenue generation
X45	Control over economic growth
X46	Civic Leadership
X47	Public attitude
X48	Volunteer involvement
X49	Strategic planning/workplan
X50	Organizational development
X51	Initial assessment of community needs or conditions
X52	Partnering
X53	Promotion
X54	Strategic Planning or Work Plan development
X55	Design that enhances visual appeal of CBD
X56	Needs update or program evaluation
X57	Business assistance services
X58	Business and or developer recruitment
X59	Major new development project*
X60	Rehabilitation financing promotion
X61	Public infrastructure construction or rehabilitation
X62	Upgrading of city services
X63	Incentive programs
X64	Market analysis
X65	Other CBD revitalization activities
X66	Inadequate public funding
X67	Inadequate private funding*
X68	Lack of private participation
X69	Low level of political support for CBD program
X70	Community Opposition
X71	Poor Management of CBD program
X72	Failure of a specific project in the CBD program
X73	Other obstacles
X74	Venture capital
X75	Low interest loan program
X76	Local grant program
X77	Historic tax credits
X78	ISTEA
X79	Other incentives
X80	Major project as part of the CBD revitalization program

TABLE B1 (continued)
List of Variables Used in the Regression Analysis

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Description</u>
X81	Review board for construction
X82	Historic ordinances
X83	Local design control ordinances
X84	Non-financial assistance to CBD firms
X85	Financial assistance to CBD firms
X86	Public relations campaign
X87	Retail events (coordinated)
X88	Festivals
X89	Population
X90	Manufacturing dependent
X91	Services oriented
X92	Farm dependent
X93	Government dependent
X94	Non-specialized
X95	M.S.A.
X96	Mining base

* Significant Variables

VITA

Robert Rushing

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT REVITALIZATION EFFORTS IN
OKLAHOMA

Major Field: Agricultural Economics

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Eldorado, Kansas, on March 2, 1971, the son of Wilton and Judy Rushing.

Education: Graduated from John Marshall High School, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma in May 1989; received Associate of Science Degree in Agriculture from Connors State College, Warner, Oklahoma in May 1991; received Bachelor of Science Degree in Agricultural Economics from Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma in May 1994. Completed the requirements for the Master of Science Degree with a major in Agricultural Economics at Oklahoma State University in December 1996.

Experience: Worked as a grounds keeper and maintenance man at the National Cowboy Hall of Fame in Oklahoma City from 1988 to 1994; worked as a greenhouse assistant, Connors State College, 1990; employed as a Teacher's Assistant for an agricultural marketing class, Oklahoma State University, Agricultural Economics Department, 1992; employed as a Graduate Research Assistant, Oklahoma State University, Agricultural Economics Department, 1994 to 1996.

**OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
HUMAN SUBJECTS REVIEW**

Date: 10-18-95

IRB#: AG-96-007

Proposal Title: DOWNTOWN REVITALIZATION PROJECT

Principal Investigator(s): Mike Woods, Robert Rushing

Reviewed and Processed as: Exempt

Approval Status Recommended by Reviewer(s): Approved

ALL APPROVALS MAY BE SUBJECT TO REVIEW BY FULL INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD AT NEXT MEETING, AS WELL AS ARE SUBJECT TO MONITORING AT ANY TIME DURING THE APPROVAL PERIOD.

APPROVAL STATUS PERIOD VALID FOR ONE CALENDAR YEAR AFTER WHICH A CONTINUATION OR RENEWAL REQUEST IS REQUIRED TO BE SUBMITTED FOR BOARD APPROVAL.

ANY MODIFICATIONS TO APPROVED PROJECT MUST ALSO BE SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL.

Comments, Modifications/Conditions for Approval or Reasons for Deferral or Disapproval are as follows:

Signature:


Chair of Institutional Review Board

Date: October 23, 1995